Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 38 APRIL, 1932 Number 4

EDITORIAL

A Word for the Times—The Unshakable Kingdom

Hebrews 12:28, 29

THE background of this text is a prophecy in Habakkuk. It was in the fall of the year 520. The Persian Empire was at the height of its glory. Darius, who carried his victorious arms to the edge of the Ægean and even threatened Europe, was upon the throne. The captive Jews whom Nebuchadnezzar had brought down from Judea had nearly all died in bondage. A few only had survived, to witness the truth of God's promise, that after seventy years he would return them to their native land. The younger generation born in captivity had been freed and given the privilege of returning to rebuild the ruin of Jerusalem. One can imagine the emotion of these repatriated Jews, when for the first time standing upon the holy mount of Zion they looked abroad upon hills and valleys that had been a sacred tradition to them from their infancy. The land of their fathers! The land of Jehovah's mighty providences! The land of their kings and prophets; of their tragedies and their triumphs! Jerusalem, the Holy City!

Some years had now passed since first these captives had returned, and had rebuilt their homes, but they could not seem to find time to restore the Temple of God. Then God spoke to them through the prophet. He warned them that they were omitting the most fundamental responsibility, and that nothing else which they might undertake could be fully successful until they put their relation to Him into effective expression.

The people heard the word of reproof, and immediately set themselves to the task of rebuilding their religious worship. They laid the foundation of God's house, but their work seemed to them small, and their hearts were discouraged. Then God sent them a second message, a message of promise and encouragement. He said, "Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth and the sea, and the dry land; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts."

The promise was powerfully fulfilled. The centuries that followed saw every human institution shaken again and again. The Persian Empire was soon overwhelmed by Greece, and the brilliant Hellenes gave their civilization and culture to the world. Intellectually the Greek supremacy was to endure for many centuries, but politically its period was brief. Within a century and a half it had fallen, and iron-handed Rome had forged its mighty chain around the Mediterranean world. From Spain at the west to the Euphrates on the east, Roman authority was spread out, and Roman order ruled. Yet still God shook the institutions of men until their religions like their empires tottered and fell. The gods of Greece and Rome dissolved away like dew when the sun is up. As the old world drew toward its close, it seemed as if every institution was trembling to its fall. Bewilderment was upon every hand. People feared as they thought toward the future, wondering if any foundations would endure.

Then in the midst of this anxiety and confusion He came, the Desire of all nations. He set up His Kingdom. Its foundations were laid in the deepest moral and spiritual realities of man's soul, and in a sure witness

to mighty events that had evidently taken place in the stream of human history. It went straight forward. It seemed to conquer by a resistless inner power. For two thousand years now it has endured and increased. Empires have come and gone—civilizations have risen and fallen—but the Kingdom of Christ has continued. It cannot be shaken. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews lived in the midst of these tremendous beginnings. He saw human institutions tottering about him, and he saw prophetically the strength of this one unique institution. He wrote triumphantly, exultantly to his times: "Wherefore receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear; for our God is a consuming fire."

My thought is to survey the strength of this divine kingdom as it towers unmoved above the dust of man's falling ambitions; and feel with the apostle the call to possess ourselves of grace that we may indeed serve God with reverence and acceptably.

When Christ's kingdom was projected the Roman Empire was mistress of the world. It sat upon its seven hills, and all kingdoms, both civilized and barbarian, brought it tribute. It was an empire of power, cruel, bloody, heartless. One can get an impression of its stern, insensitive might from this circumstance. Gladiators were trained how to die, so that they might the more effectively amuse the populace. They were even fed a particular kind of food that their blood might have a rich color and a thick, slow-moving quality. These things tended to make the sight of their wounds a more pleasing spectacle. Rome loved to gaze upon red flowing blood. The empire of the Cæsars had indeed no soul. It was a thing of power, of physical brute force. And in the midst of this ruthless empire Christ's gentle kingdom was established; and when the empire had decayed and been overthrown, Christ's kingdom still endured unhurt amid the ruin (compare Tytler's History Bk. 4, Chap. 4).

In the fifth century, the barbarians of northern Europe swept down upon the Roman world. They destroyed its civilization. Its laws, its peace, its culture perished. In place of the unity of Rome, there were a hundred military chieftains, dukes, counts and earls, each established in his castle; each surrounded by his vassals, who tilled the ground for him in times of peace and fought for him in times of war. In return for such service these chieftains gave their vassals protection from the other military leaders who had divided Europe between themselves. Empires, states, order, learning had largely disappeared.

It was a wild world of war, ignorance and confusion. We think of it as the Dark Ages; nevertheless in the midst of that darkness shone the light of the Kingdom of Christ. It had survived the cataclysm. It had stood when everything else had fallen. The Church converted the barbarian. It preached among men its sublime, its gentle and yet flaming Gospel. It produced notable saints in spite of the surrounding confusion and sin. Some of the noblest expressions that have enriched the ages were written by the men and women of those days. It was then Bernard of Clairvaux wrote his hymns that are still sung 'round the world, that Thomas à Kempis wrote his *Imitation of Christ* and St. Anselm his *Cur Deus Homo*. The institutions of those days were crude. Its order and justice were of the sword. There was no freedom; but the Kingdom of Christ was there, and its truth was making the souls of individual men divinely white.

Then came the Renaissance, a time of intellectual quickening. Columbus discovered the west. Gutenberg invented printing. Scholasticism, based upon the philosophy of Aristotle, gave place to a new inductive point of view. It was the birth of modern science. Ptolemaic astronomy was replaced by the Copernican system. Feudalism disappeared. Kings began to bring unity out of the welters of confusion. England, France, Spain, Germany were becoming orderly states. Slavery was banished from Europe. War was curtailed. Learning was multiplied; and in all this progress the Kingdom of Christ was its soul, its energy, its light. Men were coming to see what the righteousness of the Kingdom was. They were moving toward its freedom. Human institutions again were changing,—but the new order of civilization that was replacing feudalism,—what was it? It was Christ's Kingdom.

The Reformation burst. It energized and illuminated a continent. It exalted common manhood. It enlarged freedom. Parliaments began to come to the fore. The authority of kings was reduced. The American Republic appeared upon a stage of history, the first

expression in government of the truth of Christ. Then one by one kings passed, and the age of freedom dawned. It was the Kingdom of Christ surviving the surrounding changes, producing them, crowning them.

But against what frightful resistance this progress has been achieved. At the start Pagan learning challenged the Apostolic Church, mocking its adherents as the worshippers of a crucified ass. Later the Empire marshalled its brute force against the kingdom in the dreadful persecutions from Nero to Diocletian. In the fourth century, when the empire laid down the sword the barbarians took it up and became the persecutors. The Vandals dragged and drove African Christians into the wilderness, and left them there to starve and die. These were times of trial, but the Kingdom endured.

Then came the scourge of inner corruption. The Kingdom decayed within. Oh, the tragedy of these centuries of ecclesiastical corruption toward the close of the Middle Ages! Oh, the fury of its dread inquisition! Oh, the tragic brutality and bigotry of St. Bartholomew's Eve, when ten thousand of France's best bit the dust and died in their blood. Oh, the anguish of a hundred years of war, which drenched Europe with agony and darkness! But at last it was past, and when the dust of falling human institutions had cleared away, Christ's Kingdom stood both firm and purified. The Roman Church had been reformed. Protestant Christianity had been established.

Yes, God has been shaking, He has been turning and overturning. Governments have come and gone; civilizations have risen and perished; philosophies have succeeded each other; science has changed; but Christ sweeps on; His Kingdom is eternal; it cannot be shaken.

Take one vivid picture of these struggling forces and Christ's serene, inevitable triumph. In 1660 there was a reaction from that idealism through law which characterized Puritan England. A spirit of liberalism, almost of libertinism, reseated the Stuarts upon the throne of England. Ideals were forgotten; lust became dominant. These willful times produced Deistic philosophy—speculative system of self-sufficiency and self-assertiveness. English civilization decayed and was only saved by the Wesleyan revival. The rationalistic point of view was developed in France by Voltaire and the Encyclopedists. They mocked Christ's Kingdom; they called its King "the wretch," and boldly talked of crushing Him. They announced the near collapse of His influence, the passing of His superstition. In the capital of France the Reign of Terror for a moment dethroned Him, and set up in His place a Parisian harlot as a symbol of man's proud self-sufficient reason. The streets of the city ran with blood. It was indeed, "The Terror." Thomas Paine brought this frenzy to America. The Universities caught it. Students at Yale called themselves by the names of French infidels. Unbelief became rampant. National morality began to decline. Washington viewed the situation with apprehension and warned the Republic of its peril in the decline of religion. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church lamented the dreadful break-down of public morals, and feared for the future.

Then suddenly, in 1798, came the collapse of the great commercial house of David Allison in Philadelphia, and following it the panic of that year. Securities fell, fortunes were dissolved. But the light of Christ's truth had been kept shining even through the darkness, and in the midst of the panic a great revival broke out. We know it as the revival of 1801. It began in the east and swept westward over the mountains to the frontiers of the nation. It developed the familiar institution of the camp meeting. Thousands assembled in the woods to listen to the preaching of the word of God, and experience His saving power. Whole neighborhoods were converted. Whole valleys were lighted up with the light of Jesus. The Church was energized afresh. The modern missionary enterprise was born. Moffat and Livingstone went to Africa, and Judson went to India.

YES it is true. It is the witness of all history that His Kingdom cannot be shaken. In our day once again we see man's self-sufficiency and unbelief arrogant. Naturalism has built its stately pile of anti-theistic speculation from Charles Darwin to John Watson. The universities have been caught, as they were a hundred years ago. A year or two back the stage was fully set to bow Christ out. Materialism seemed almost supreme. This life was all. The future was most uncertain. Religion was insecure; we called it superstition. Commercial values

rose and rose. America counted its millionaires to almost half a hundred thousand. And then God shook the world. The panic struck. Securities toppled like a house of cards. Millionaires decreased from forty-three thousand one hundred eighty-four in 1928 to nineteen thousand six hundred and eighty-eight in 1930. The incomes of corporation and business leaders shrank eleven and a half billion of dollars. Securities were seen to be no longer secure. The accumulation of wealth as the chief interest of life suddenly lost its reality.

And then swiftly, silently, in the midst of these things, there was another collapse. The materialistic science of the opening decades of the twentieth century tumbled into dust. A little group of physicists and astronomers discovered that matter could be reduced to electricity, and electricity to a vibration, a pulsation in empty space. It became evident that matter was only an idea, and that mind was the ultimate value. Startled into humility, men took off their shoes, they were in the presence of some new flaming bush. They were standing before the invisible God.

Then came a turning back to religion, for amid all the ruin of towering majesty Christ stood unmoved, unhurt, and with a luster undimmed. In the fall of 1931 The American Bible Society reports the largest demand for the Word of God in the whole course of history. Revivals which we had been told were things of the past and would not occur again are breaking out, here and there, all over the nation. There is a revival in Trenton, New Jersey. A total of eight thousand people crowd a downtown church, and two hundred find the light of Jesus. There is a revival at White Horse, New Jersey. Seventy-five bow at the altar and experience inward peace. There is a revival at Pennsgrove, New Jersey. There is a revival in Camden, New Jersey.

On Thursday, the tenth of December, more than a hundred Methodist preachers meet in the latter city and spend five hours in humble prayer. They forget to eat. They forget the pride of human learning. They see one sublime fact, Jesus Christ, God Incarnate, virgin born, crucified for sin, risen, ascended. They see Him, the one solution of these times and of all times. They see Him the answer in every human need. In helplessness they cry to Him. In repentance, in expectancy, they wait for the inner revelation of His presence.

Never in this world can I forget the prayer with which that meeting closed. It was humble, repentant, fervent, illumined. It spoke of the littleness of the compromised gospel we had been preaching. It said men had come seeking bread and that our preaching had given them a stone. It said we had filled our minds and hearts with the vanity of wood, hay, and stubble, instead of the ageless sublimities of the Gospel. It confessed the bewildered efforts of men to be merely good fellows, forgetful of our high calling to be ministers of Jesus Christ. This prayer continued until that preacher's brow was wet with moisture, and his voice was tremulous with emotion. All around him, as he voiced these confessions and petitions, rose the responses of other ministers expressing their unity of spirit and conviction with him. The air was vibrant with sincerity and faith. In a moment of time the compromises and superficialities of decades had been shaken to the ground, and towering high above the ruin was seen the stately figure of the Christ of the Ages, serene, secure, sublime.

What does all this mean? Let me put it this way. What did it mean that fifteen hundred unemployed men marched on the Capital, during the week of December 6th? What did it mean that Foster preached his gospel of class hatred and struggle? Answer: To America it meant absolutely nothing, because in the hearts of all our citizens was the knowledge that all over this fair land and in every community relief organizations were putting into expression the brotherhood of Christ's Kingdom. Radicalism cannot sell class hatred to the American working man, because Christ's Kingdom is a fact in America. Such a march as that made upon Washington recently would have been significant in Russia fifteen years ago. It would have been significant in France in the days of the Revolution. It was such a march as that out of which the French Revolution came. The march on Washington was not significant in America today, because here Christianity is a reality.

Doubtless there are many dark spots in our industrial system. But there are many bright spots, too. How many employers have maintained the personnel of their organization through the depression and without even a decrease of wages or salaries? I was talking to one such in Philadelphia last

Friday. He told me he had lost $50,000 this year, but that every employee in his plant was receiving the same income that he had received in 1928. He told me that the motive which kept him still at his desk in his age, was the joy he had in managing the affairs of his business, for the sake of the men and women who had worked with him across the decades. There is a lot of this in American business, and it is because there is a lot of it that the proponents of class war will not be effective.

So, too, the institutions of our great Republic. No matter how they may be abused by false men, they are an expression of the highest political truth that has been seen on earth. They are an expression of the truth of the equality and brotherhood of man, the Kingdom of God, the heart of Christ. These things cannot be shaken. Institutions of men may come and go, but those institutions incarnate the reality of Christ. They will endure unhurt amid the rocking of empires. His Kingdom cannot be shaken.

Let us get the confidence of it. This is the explanation of those preachers, and their humble, eager prayers. They had read the rationalizings of men. They had been taught in the schools the impossibility of miracles and the supernatural. They had read naturalism's towering structure of speculation. They had felt the confusion of world thought and its hostility to Christ. They had been bewildered. They had compromised. And then they had seen these ideas of men tottering and falling, and they had seen anew the serene, secure, unshakable sublimity of Christ and His Kingdom. They saw Him as the one satisfying value. They turned to Him with renewed consecration, and with renewed expectancy. In Him they knew there was healing for all human guilt. In Him they knew there was power for all human helplessness. In Him they saw the one love that is inexhaustible. In Him they worshipped the one life victorious over death, that is therefore able to light up the dark cheerlessness of man's gloomy sepulchre.

OTHER values may indeed shake, but He cannot. He is imperishable. Christian men, let us stand up. Let us stand up without fear. Not one worthy thing has been shaken, nor can be shaken. Christ endures. The Bible stands. Democracy is secure. Let us rally to Him and make again His redeeming grace and truth the power and the glory of our civilization. Let us take Christ into our daily lives. Let us make Him the partner of all our endeavors. Let us rebuild our fallen family altars. Let us reconsecrate ourselves in holy worship. Let us unite with faithful devotion, seeking to forward His Kingdom by prayer, by conversations in His Name, with those who do not know Him, and by invitations to share the worship of His house with us. There will be changes in the next decade; but there will be no change in Christ; no change in His redeeming grace, no change in His almighty power, no change in the finality of His glorious truth. His Kingdom endures forever, it cannot be shaken.—*H. P. S.*

Washington—Christian and Patriot

ON December 14, 1799, George Washington, "the father of his country," passed from these finite scenes into the mystery of the infinite beyond. Upon receiving the word of this solemn event, the Senate of the United States sent a communication to President Adams including the following eulogium:

> Greatness and guilt have often been allied together, but his fame was whiter than it was brilliant. The destroyers of the nation stand abashed at the majesty of his virtue. It reproves the intemperance of their ambitions, and darkens the splendors of their victories . . . Such was the man whose death we deplore. Thank God his glory is consummated . . . Washington yet lives in his spotless example; his spirit is in heaven.

These words appreciate Washington less for the wisdom of his counsel and the resourcefulness of his leadership than for the nobility of his Christian manhood, and this will be the final estimate of his person. He was great in his devotion to his country. He was great as a counsellor. His military achievements and resource will always command the appreciative respect of men, but the supreme greatness of Washington was his own Christian personality. It was this one thing more than any other that made him a power among the leaders of his day,—the rallying center of the people in their efforts to achieve national life.

George Washington's grandfather, John Washington, was the first of his line to come to America. He came to these shores in 1657. His son, Augustine Washington, the father of George, was twice married, first to Jane Butler, by whom he had two sons, Lawrence, born in 1718 and Augustine, born in 1720. George, the third child, was the first by his second wife, and was born February 22, 1732. His mother, Mary Bell, was a descendant of "the mad preacher of Kent," whose favorite text was "All men are free and equal." There seems to have been a definite religious interest in the Bell line, for the coat-of-arms of the family bears the motto, "Look to Heaven." One wonders whether this legend was not reflected in the symbolism of the American Flag, of which Washington himself said its stars in the field of blue symbolized that Heaven to whose justice we now make our appeal.

Augustine Washington died when George was a lad not yet entered into his teens, but the father's religion already had left an impression upon the mind of his son. Through those formative years of his life George Washington had been taught reverence and godliness in the institution of family prayer both morning and evening. He had been made familiar also with such serious books as Sir Matthew Hale's *Contemplations Moral and Divine*. Washington often referred to this particular work. As a child of thirteen he compiled his own rules for conduct, and one of his notebooks contains a neatly copied record of 110 rules "For a Life of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation." A glance at these rules will help us appreciate the early seriousness of the youthful Washington.

Rule 108: When you speak of God or his attributes, let it be seriously and with reverence.

Rule 109: Obey your natural parents, though they be poor.

Rule 110: Let your recreations be manful, not sinful.

Rule 111: Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience.

WASHINGTON'S educational advantages in his youth were limited, but his contacts were themselves an education: for he lived a lifetime in contact with the best minds of his day. He entered public life when he was yet hardly a man, and retired only in his age in time to die. In 1747, at the age of fifteen, he was offered an opportunity in the British Navy through the influence of the Fairfaxes, but notwithstanding the appeal this service made to his ambition, he declined it out of deference to his mother's wishes. He made his actual start in life the next year, when at the age of sixteen he undertook the responsibility of surveying the extensive tracts of wild lands owned by his wealthy benefactors. He early attained great stature. He was a man at sixteen; standing over six feet, with large hands and feet and a powerful physique.

In 1751, when he was but nineteen years of age, he was chosen one of the officers of the colonial troops engaged in border warfare against the French and Indians. In 1753 when he was twenty-one, he was entrusted by the Governor of Virginia with a responsible mission to the French at Fort Duquesne, now Pittsburgh. This mission was at once a physical, mental and moral undertaking. It is remarkable that it should have been entrusted to one of his youth. Nevertheless he accepted the responsibility and fulfilled the trust.

In 1755, at the age of twenty-three, he was an officer under General Braddock, in the military effort of his State to bring to an end the depredations of the French and Indians upon the Virginia frontier settlements. His courageous leadership saved a remainder of Braddock's ill-fated army, when they were ambushed near Fort Duquesne. At the burial of Braddock, Washington was entrusted with the clergyman's place, and read the burial service.

FROM his young manhood Washington seems to have had two chief interests: military service and agriculture. His library of some 1,200 volumes was largely made up of texts upon these two subjects. After the failure of the British expedition to Pittsburgh, Washington himself was entrusted with the defense of the Virginia border, and for several years until the end of 1758, he struggled both against the French and Indians, and against the dilatory policy of Governor Dinwiddie. It seems almost as if, far back there at the beginning of his life, Providence was preparing him for the work which he was afterward to do. From his childhood through to his retirement he was constantly thrown upon his own resources, and required to do that which was impossible of accomplishment.

In 1756-58 the Governor of Virginia wanted the State defended, but he seemed not to have the means of raising an army adequate to its defense; and Washington, then, as later in 1777, '78 was faced with the difficult responsibility of accomplishing results without the proper equipment. Toward the close of the year 1758, when Washington was a young man twenty-six years of age, he saw the accomplishment of his first military project, the reduction of Fort Duquesne. After this he retired from the service, and on January 6, 1759, married Martha Custis, a wealthy widow of his native Virginia.

The years from 1759-1774 were spent largely at Mount Vernon in the development of his estates, and in the enjoyment of private life. However, Washington was not entirely free from public responsibility, even during this period, for he was a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, and was also a representative of his colony in the first and second Continental Congresses, which met in Philadelphia October 7, 1765, and September 5, 1774. With the calling of the third Congress on May 10, 1775, Washington's experience of private life came definitely to an end. He was then a man of forty-three years of age. He went as one of the representatives of Virginia to the third Continental Congress, and on June 14, 1775, was elected Commander-in-Chief of the Colonial Army.

The next eight years of George Washington's life are years of such heroic devotion, high living, and spiritual sacrifice as few men would be capable of. Four times only in this period Washington knew the thrill of victory in his own immediate leadership. Apart from these four experiences his life from 1775-1783 was one of retreat, of struggle, of discouragement, and of desolate lonely prayer.

On March 17, 1776, he had the joy of seeing the British march out of Boston, and of knowing that his military strategy had freed New England. But this triumph was swiftly followed by disaster. He suffered two defeats in the environs of New York. One in the battle of Long Island, the other at White Plains. His army melted away, and late in November-December, 1776, he made his discouraged way across the State of New Jersey and beyond the Delaware, into Pennsylvania, with hardly more than 3,000 ragged poorly equipped troops around him. At that time Washington with this thin line, is all that stood between our half born country and disaster.

ONE gets a remarkable inlook into the sheer creative willing of the man in that incident known as "the crossing of the Delaware." Washington had appealed to Congress to recruit his army, and they had failed. He appealed to the Governors of the States to come to his assistance, and they too had failed. He saw that something must be done to revive the dying hope of the people. He divided his little army into three groups, one of which was to cross the Delaware nine miles above Trenton; a second at Trenton, and a third at Burlington. These three divisions were to make a simultaneous assault upon Trenton, capture its Hessian defenders, and then retire out of reach of Cornwallis' powerful and well-equipped army.

The night of December 25, 1776, was cold and stormy. The Delaware was full of floating ice. The commanders opposite Trenton and Burlington gave up the enterprise. They could not make the crossing. Washington's engineers told him it was impossible. He told them it must be done. They renewed their protests, and he renewed his high resolve. All night long on the night of the 25th they toiled to make their way through the ice. They landed in the early hours of the morning of the 26th. The soldiers left the mark of their naked feet upon the snow of the roads. One man froze to death from exposure; but Washington led his little army of 2,400 into the city, defeated its Hessian garrison, took possession of the city and captured 1,000 prisoners.

It is a sidelight upon the character of the man, that after his victory he stopped to bring comfort to Captain Rahl, commander of the British, who had been mortally wounded in the engagement. Washington had 2,400 men. The other divisions of his army, which were later brought in contact with the main column, increased it to something above 4,000. Cornwallis had more than eight thousand men. Washington nevertheless remained in Trenton, and on January 2 fought the British in the Battle of Assanpink Creek. He fought until evening; but knowing well that his slim columns could not stand another day's fighting, he retreated during the night, keeping his campfires brightly burning. He marched around the

British left flank, moving northward to Princeton, where he came upon the rear of their army which was moving up to reinforce the main body. He defeated these troops and then passed out of reach up into the hills of Morris County.

These two triumphs achieved by personal resource, high willing, and wise strategy, against insurmountable difficulties were the last thrills of victory Washington was to know until at last it was his privilege to receive the sword of the British Commander at Yorktown five years later.

ONE gets another inlook into the character of the man in connection with the strategy which accomplished the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga Springs. Washington was Commander-in-Chief of all the military forces of the Colonies. During the years 1776-1779, there were two theaters of war, that around New York, and that nearer to Philadelphia. Washington was responsible for both. A tragic blunder made in the department of New York caused the fall of Fort Ticonderoga on July 5, 1777. It was a serious disaster. Washington immediately reduced his own forces to recruit the department of New York, sending his crack regiment, Morgan's Virginia Sharp Shooters, to be the shock troops of the northern army. This reduced his army to some 11,000 men, and with these he faced General Howe with 18,000 British soldiers.

Feeling his necessity, he sent to General Gates a request for the return of Morgan, but Gates failed to respond to his request. Washington fought the Battle of Brandywine on September 11, without these troops who a week later won the Battle of Bemis Heights in New York (September 18). On October 4 Washington fought the Battle of Germantown, again without Morgan's men, whom Gates still detained in New York, notwithstanding he had 15,000 soldiers with which to oppose Burgoyne's 6,000. Washington fought two battles against frightful odds, and suffered his best regiment to remain with Gates, who at the same time was fighting two battles not against frightful odds but with a superiority of over two to one. A blind man could not miss this bigness of a character who would be capable of such self-sacrifice. Washington was not fighting for ambition or honor; he was fighting for a sacred cause; and he sacrificed his own credit to make certain of a victory in another territory for a colleague. Afterwards Gates rewarded him by conspiring to supplant him, but this is another story, although it follows close upon the one which has just been told.

Washington's defeat at Germantown took place on October 4. Burgoyne's surrender at Saratoga took place on October 17. Very soon after these events Washington goes into winter quarters at Valley Forge, his army naked and cold and hungry, while Gates, Conway and Mifflin conduct a cable in Congress to accomplish his removal, and replacement by Gates. These three men who are conspiring for Washington's removal are made a Board of War. Congress is evidently lukewarm toward the Commander-in-Chief. This Board of War projects without consulting Washington a winter invasion into Canada, which finally falls through. The Commissary Department breaks down, and Congress does nothing about it. Repeatedly Washington is unable to march his army for lack of food, and some of the soldiers even wear clothes made out of bedding to keep from freezing. For a time Washington is compelled to take his supplies by military force, tendering in payment bills of credit upon Congress.

During all this time he is serving without pay, and meeting his own expenses out of his private fortune. He has absolutely nothing to gain, and everything to lose by continuing in leadership. He faces the discouragement of an army so neglected that it is repeatedly mutinous, and the embarrassment of meddling civil leaders, who are constantly interfering with military responsibilities. Such is his condition during the winter of 1777-78, nevertheless he seems not even to have been tempted to embrace that easy release from his difficulties which he might have secured by resigning; no, not even when the Conway Cable was at its height, and the influence of the disaffected group was powerful in Congress. With a devotion that seems almost unbounded, and a courage that is beyond praise, he found his own strength in prayer, and faced steadily forward, with one high resolve, that however and by whatever sacrifice it might be achieved, this nation should be made free.

On June 25, 1778, he fought the battle of Monmouth, which should have been a victory, but which was not a victory, because General Lee appointed to high command by the meddling of Congress, betrayed his coun-

try's cause or else bungled it. Washington in person rallied his retreating troops and won a drawn battle out of what should have been a victory.

Through the year 1779, Washington watched and waited, too weak to strike, but too strong in high resolve to surrender. In 1780 the war moved into the South, and Washington again depleted his own army, reducing it to less than 4,000 men, that he might strengthen Lincoln, Gates and Greene in Georgia and the Carolinas. It was during this year that the treason of Arnold saddened him. There is a volume in the sentence addressed to Washington after this betrayal by the Marquis Lafayette. He said, "Whom now can we trust?" What must have been the heartache and the lonely purposing of the great man whose own high resolve seemed to be almost the only bulwark of the colonial cause in those dreadful days! His chief greatness was the greatness of his character.

Again and again there were mutinies in the army because of lack of pay, lack of food, lack of clothes. Each time Washington met the situation, inspired the men, and saved the army and the country. The surrender at Yorktown came on October 19, 1781. It practically ended the war, but the armies continued in the field more than eighteen months longer, with little activity. Washington was camped at Newburgh on the Hudson when spring broke after the winter of 1782-83. The troops saw peace drawing nearer, and realized that the wrongs they had suffered would never be righted unless some steps were taken immediately. A mutiny was organized in March.

This time it was among the officers. They wanted to demand by military force their rights from Congress and the country. On the tenth of March Washington met them at the assembly they had called. He took out of his pocket a prepared paper and began to read. He saw dimly. It made him aware he had not put on his glasses. Laying down the paper and putting his hand in his pocket for his glasses he said, "Gentlemen, I have grown gray in the service, and now I perceive I am growing blind." Major Shaw, who was present, reports the profound impression made upon all those present. Having adjusted his glasses, Washington then read his paper, and the mutiny at Newburgh melted away, as April snows disappear when the sun is up.

NINE months later, Washington was at the seat of Congress in Annapolis, Maryland, to resign his commission. He was formally received at twelve o'clock noon on December 23. It was an impressive occasion. Continental Congress sat upon the floor, their heads covered. In the galleries were the guests of the occasion, both ladies and gentlemen. The Commander-in-Chief was presented and briefly addressed the assembly. He spoke of the work which had been finished, referred to the interpositions of divine Providence which again and again had saved the national cause from disaster, and then concluded:

> I consider it an indispensable duty in closing this last act of my official life, to commend the interests of our dearest country to the protection of Almighty God, and those who have the superintendency of them to his mighty keeping.

With these words, Washington retired to his estate at Mount Vernon; but not to forget the needs of the country whose liberty he had won by his arms.

Already he had addressed a letter to the governors of the thirteen states, urging upon them the necessity of developing an effective unity, of fulfilling the Nation's sacred obligations of justice, of providing for the adoption of a proper peace establishment, and of developing friendship and understanding among the several sections. Later on, during 1785-86 he sought himself to promote unity by developing the means of commercial intercourse. He suggested the routes of what later became the Erie, and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canals. He became president of a company for developing the navigation of the Potomac and James Rivers. He brought the states of Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania and Delaware into a convention to consider the propriety of a uniform coinage and uniform duties. Out of this last came the Constitutional Convention of May 14, 1787.

Of this historic gathering he was president; and it was his high devotion to reality that saved it both from weak expediency and from final failure. After the completion of the Federal Constitution and the adjournment of the Convention, September 17, 1787, he helped to win its adoption by the country. He became the first President, and it was his magnificent character, poise and sagacity which led the nation's way through those first difficult years. He organized the government. He established its credit at home and abroad. He provided for the payment of its

debts. He led it in meeting the obligations owned to its patriot soldiers. He held it steady through the dreadful excitement of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. His patience and clear purpose met the problems connected with the agitations against our neutrality by Ambassador Genet. He established for all time the authority of law against armed resistance by crushing the Whiskey Rebellion in the State of Pennsylvania. But before he crushed it, he first undermined it by three years of patient civil leadership, with the result that the final military stroke was a bloodless victory.

FINALLY on March 4, 1797, he retired voluntarily, after two terms as President. He did this as an example to all the future. He aimed thus to set a precedent that would tend to keep the government forever free from the domination of any one individual or group. At his retirement he addressed the nation a valedictory message, which along with many words of wisdom and items of advice, contains the following statement concerning the fundamental importance of religion to the Republic:

> Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them . . . A volume could not trace all their connexions with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.
>
> It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

In recent years it has become popular to seek to discredit the character of George Washington. One finds it difficult to appreciate the motives which actuate any sincere student in such an effort; but the facts are too abundant to make it possible for any man effectively to call in question either his sincerity or his high religious devotion. Washington's background in life was religious. He grew up in a home where family prayer was the daily practice. Before he had entered his teens, as the oldest son, he was repeatedly called upon to conduct family prayer. He asked the blessing at his own table. His nephew, Robert Lewis, is authority for the statement that it was his daily practice to read the Scripture and engage in prayer, at the beginning of each new day. After reading it was his custom to kneel with his open Bible before him thus addressing the Infinite. While head of the army he maintained worship, and his Orderly Books contain many references to worship and to its importance. At Newburgh his Orderly Book contains this entry:

> The regularity with which divine service is performed every Sunday will tend to improve the morals of the army, and at the same time to increase the happiness of the soldier.

In the address to the governors of the States, immediately following the close of the Revolutionary War, Washington makes repeated reference to religion, and speaks of the happy circumstance that the erection of the American Republic has taken place at a time when "the pure light of revelation," together with certain other factors, had so extensively meliorated and influenced mankind. There were four references to the providence of God, and a considerable paragraph expressing his prayers for the country in this document.

After he had taken the oath of office as President of the United States, he went to St. Paul's Church on Fulton Street, where the auspicious occasion was celebrated with a sermon and the celebration of the communion. At his leave-taking of his friends in Mt. Vernon when he went to assume his responsibilities as President of the United States, he spoke with touching power of the providence of God, saying:

> It remains but for me to commit myself and you to the care of that benign Being, who on a former occasion happily brought us together, after a long and distressing separation. Perhaps the same gracious Providence will again indulge me, but words fail me: unutterable sentiments must be left to a more expressive silence.

In similar vein he addresses the people of Philadelphia on his way from Virginia to New York, saying:

> When I contemplate the interpositions of Providence as it was manifested in guiding us through the Revolution, in preparing us for the reception of the general government, and in conciliating the

good will of the people of America toward one another after its adoption, I feel myself oppressed, and almost overwhelmed with a sense of the divine munificence.

IN view of such consistent and persistent expressions it is nothing short of childish for men to magnify mere passing incidents such as that he followed the hounds, or played at cards, or won or lost some small sums of money in his games into important biographical items, and because of them seek to throw discredit upon the major drive of his character. Not only was Washington a religious man, and a man of high Christian character but his spiritual greatness was the main spring of all his creative influence. It was his spiritual greatness that lifted him above petty motives and easy discouragement. It was his spiritual greatness that enabled him to quiet the burning resentment of the wronged, neglected, hungry, naked soldiers. It was his spiritual greatness again that gave him the poise for leadership, enabling him to bear with patience the warring factions of his Cabinet, and to appreciate the great men, whose differences so burdened him. To deny the moral and spiritual greatness of Washington, and to present him as a drinker and gamester is simply to advertise one's own lack of historical insight.

John Marshall, the first justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, brings this tribute to the sublime life of this heroic man. He calls him "The First in War, The First in Peace, and the First in the Hearts of his countrymen," and the eulogy is true. Among the many who imperilled their all for liberty, he does indeed stand first. Among those who bared their breasts to death that we might be a free people, he was ever in the van. When hardship and neglect made stout hearts faint, his heart the stoutest of them all failed not, and his fortitude quickened new courage in others. When Congress failed him, he stood alone, strong in his own heart's great faith in God. Men rallied around him; fought under him; suffered with him, until at last our enemies were defeated, and our country was free. When the struggle was over he who had shown men how to wield power without ambition, showed them how to resign it without regret, and then at length, when life's toil was done, he who has shown men how to live, showed them how to die.

On December 13, 1799, riding over his estate at Mount Vernon in the rain, his clothes became damp and his hair wet. He was taken with a sudden attack of influenza, and felt from the beginning that his illness would be fatal. Home remedies were administered to him. On the morning of the 14th he sent for his family physician, Dr. Craik, but his condition was beyond human recourse. He lay in his bed, his head in the lap of his doctor, who was also his friend. As he lay there he knew that death had come. He said, "Doctor, I am dying, but I am not afraid to die." Later he uttered the short sentence, "It is well," and passed from earth into the infinite. Well indeed did the Senate say of him, "Washington yet lives in his spotless example; his spirit is in Heaven."

Answers to Some Current Misstatements of the University

THE March issue of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE carried an interesting correspondence between a professor and a graduate of a nominally Christian college.

It also carried an account of another professor's criticism of the New Testament. The editor promised an answer to these two professors in the succeeding issue of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE. The statements made by the professor's and the editor's replies follow.

I. PROGRESSIVE REVELATION

"The Bible contains many of the errors of a long past age. When we try to defend all as equally infallible, we only make a mess."

The evangelical position does indeed regard the Bible as divinely inspired in every part, but it recognizes an increase in the level and fullness of divine revelation, so that the words "equally infallible" would be misleading, as an expression of the evangelical position. For example, Jesus repeatedly draws a distinction between the incomplete statements of ethical truth given by God in and for Old Testament times, and the higher levels of ethical truth as He Himself is teaching them. This difference does not deny that the

lower level was a divinely given truth for the age to which it was given. For example, in the Old Testament justice is a limitation upon revenge, whereas in the New Testament it has become an unbounded obligation to love all one's fellow beings. Had this New Testament revelation been given in Old Testament times it would have been utterly ineffective and inapplicable; consequently God did not give it there, but reserved it until Israel had a background of fifteen hundred years of religious, ethical and social history.

We recognize this need for adapting the statement of an ideal to those to whom it is given in ordinary life. No father, for example, would attempt to state the law of his home to a sinful boy of six as he would state it to a consecrated Christian youth of eighteen. Similarly, again, legislation is one thing in frontier states, and another thing in old established, highly moral communities. We had exactly this same contrast between Israel in the Old Testament and New Testament times. The moral ideal as Jesus revealed it would not have been appropriate in the wilderness. The fact of progressive revelation is incontestable, but that God's Word is truth in every part is equally true.

The fact is, there are evidences of a supernatural divine revelation in the Old Testament writings which are unescapable. For example, Israel's monotheism in the midst of the surrounding polytheism of the nations. Or again, Israel's uniquely high ethical and religious ideas, which even in the early Old Testament contained suggestions of final New Testament truths; and this in spite of the fact that neither the surrounding nations, nor yet the learning of Greece discovered these truths even centuries later. Third, there was the increasing Messianic hope, which began in the earliest Old Testament documents, and came on down with fuller and fuller power, until it was the chief idea in contemporary Jewish thought and life. Here are unique values, characteristic of the Old Testament literature, which definitely certify its supernatural origin.

II. Bible Contradictions

"The Bible has many contradictions; for example, Luke says Jesus told his disciples to stay in Jerusalem after his death, and Matthew says that he told them to go to Galilee."

One is amazed that a Bible teacher could be so uninformed with respect to Biblical data. In Paul's synopsis of the resurrection appearances as set forth in 1 Corinthians 15: 3 and following, the apostle notes that Jesus appeared to the Twelve, then to above five hundred brethren at once, and finally to all the disciples. The appearance to five hundred brethren at once clearly suggests Galilee, since it was there our Lord had a considerable body of followers. This was the official appearance, the one promised in advance, as referred to in the synoptics. That it was preceded by introductory appearances on the first Easter evening, and also on the eighth day, is not at all surprising. After these early manifestations, as St. John tells us, the disciples did go into Galilee, where there were other appearances of Jesus. Later there was a final appearance in Jerusalem, at which time our Lord led His followers out to the Mount of Olives, where He gave them their closing instruction, telling them to remain in the capital city and to begin the world-wide publishing of the gospel from that point. To confuse this instruction to remain in Jerusalem after the ascension with the instruction as recorded in Matthew to go into Galilee, manifests an astonishing blindness. There is no contradiction whatever in these Biblical records. There was a great Galilean appearance, which was the evidential background of Jewish Christianity. Afterward there was a Jerusalem and Mount of Olives appearance; and in connection with this latter manifestation came the instruction to remain in the capital city, and to begin the preaching of the gospel there where the background of the open, empty sepulchre was a physical exhibit supporting the testimony of the resurrection.

III. St. Paul and Redemption

"Paul brought into Christianity the idea that God forgives us because Jesus offered a human sacrifice. This idea of human sacrifice is a very old heathen idea. The Jewish prophets rejected it centuries before Christ came (Malachi 6:6). Jesus would have had no patience with such an idea."

This statement of the professor is mere dogmatism, with no foundation in fact. Our Lord refers to His redemptive death according to the synoptic record no less than twenty-seven times, and after His resurrection commissioned His disciples to preach for-

giveness of sins in contact with the fact of his sacrificial suffering (See Luke 24:26 and 46). Not only do we find this instruction in the gospels and these advance references to our Lord's redemptive suffering, but we find the remission of sins through faith in Christ as one crucified and risen again the continual emphasis in every sermon recorded in the early part of the Acts. We find the same emphasis in Peter and in John. John even uses the word propitiation, and Peter says that we are redeemed with precious blood. Paul found this emphasis and by the record Christ Himself is responsible for its genesis.

Paul did systematize it into a philosophy, but to systematize an idea is not to create one. That the idea of sacrifice is familiar in heathendom is nothing against it; it is also familiar in Old Testament literature. The quotation from Malachi is an interesting piece of perverted interpretation. Because the prophet protests against ritual observances that are without ethical passion does not mean at all that his soul would have burned against ritual observances that were sincere and ethically vital. A non-ethical observance makes a religious act a mere superstition, and offensive to God: but the offensiveness arises in the loss of ethical sincerity not in the institution itself. A prophet could easily denounce such without discrimination, and yet in his own consciousness recognize fully that it was not the institution he challenged, but the lack of ethical content in the people's observance of it.

To me it is an impressive fact that all religions have such a sense of judgment and that the sacrificial idea is unescapable. The fact is, it is not only unescapable but true. Guilt has demerit, and to see the demerit of guilt expressed upon it, even when it is upon one's self, amounts to a fundamental moral passion of the race. Modern ethical thinking in its rejection of judgment and penalty shows its ethical superficiality, and consequently its incapacity to understand the profound moral depth in the Word of God.

IV. Concerning the Virgin Birth

"The question whether Jesus had two parents has nothing to do with our thought as to the nature of sin, or as to the grace of God. The idea of birth from a virgin came simply from a mis-translation of Isaiah 7:14."

Of course, no one thinks that virgin birth has any significance in connection with the nature of sin or the grace of God. Virgin Birth is a sublimely fit method by which the divine-human nature of the Redeemer could be and was constituted. The virgin birth of Jesus is not in the judgment of this writer a primary evidence of His Deity. The evidence of our Lord's Deity begins with the historical circumstance of His resurrection from the dead, and moves backward through the total record of His life, and the prophetic expectation lying behind it.

In this whole sweep of historical data, the testimony of the New Testament to the virgin birth of Jesus becomes a valuable item of truth. The professor's suggestion that the record of our Lord's virgin birth came from a mistranslation of Isaiah 7:14 is rather startling. Papias tells us that Matthew wrote the Logia in Hebrew; and Professor Allen, who writes the commentary on Matthew in the International Critical Series, admits repeatedly the influence of the Hebrew Old Testament on Matthew's citations of Scripture.

There is a similar Hebrew background manifest in the first two chapters of the gospel according to St. Luke, so that the circumstance of the translation of Isaiah 7:14 by the Greek *parthenos* does not seem to be an adequate explanation of the rise of the New Testament belief in our Lord's virgin birth. The Hebrew of Isaiah 7:14 does not call for the Greek *parthenos* as Professor Robert Dick Wilson has pointed out. It should not have been *alma* but *bethula* if virgin was intended *alma*, meaning not virgin, but a young unmarried woman of whom virginity might be presumed.

Professor Allen calls attention to the fact that Matthew was thoroughly acquainted with rabbinical lore, and in his quotation of the Old Testament in Matthew 27:9, the whole point of his discussion is grounded on a slight modification of a Hebrew word. To one who thus knew Hebrew, a mis-translation of Isaiah 7:14 could not possibly have given rise to the unique story of Jesus' virgin birth. Compare also Professor Allen's admission that Matthew used the Hebrew Old Testament in connection with chapter 2, verse 6, and chapter 2, verse 18.

WE turn now to the second professor, who according to the student's notes written the same day spoke as follows:

V. Accuracy of Our New Testaments

"How can we believe the Bible when it is

thousands of years old, and has been translated and retranslated from Hebrew and Greek into Latin and the vernacular, and finally into English, and has been modified by such *moral* characters as Henry the VIII?"

The English New Testament was not translated from Greek into Latin, the vernacular, and then finally into English. It was translated directly from the Greek into the English both by the translators of the King James version, and also of the Revision. They did indeed compare the learning of the past and the versions of the past, but they had Greek manuscripts before them in their labors. The present student of the New Testament has an even better equipment. He has admittedly fourth century manuscripts, the substantial accuracy of which is no longer challenged by any responsible writer. The fact that the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament were translated into the Syriac in the second century, and that the Syriac gospels are substantially identical with our fourth century Greek gospels proves the integrity of the Greek text.

As to Henry the VIII and other evil personalities, they have had no more effect upon the New Testament records than they have had upon the lectures of this particular professor. Such an ignorant tirade upon the reliability of the Biblical record of our Lord's Person does no credit to the distinguished educational institution in which this gentleman teaches.

VI. Evangelists Not Old When They Wrote

"Matthew, Mark, Luke and John—none of them wrote until they were old men, and when the events of those years were vague and forgotten." Evidently again our professor is talking on the basis of vague and general misinformation, rather than of definite investigations. Harnack believes that the Apostle St. Matthew wrote an account of the words of Jesus as early as the year forty; that Mark and Luke were both in existence before the end of the sixth decade. Paul was substantially the same age as our Lord, which would mean that he was in his late fifties at the time of his imprisonment in Caesarea. When the last of his three epistles was written, Luke, his companion, was almost certainly a younger man, for one of St. Paul's driving energy would not be apt to attach to himself as a travelling companion an older person. Mark was certainly younger than St. Paul, so that both St. Mark and St. Luke must have been produced when their authors were yet in mid-life.

When the Matthaean Logia were combined into the gospel of St. Matthew is uncertain. There are some indications in the text that St. Luke had Matthew before him when he wrote his gospel; but there is no reason to suppose that any of the gospel narratives were produced in the great age of their authors, except in the case of St. John. It needs also to be born in mind that these men had been busy telling the story of our Lord's life, death and resurrection continuously from their youth, so that the late writings of the gospels, even if true, would not detract from their accuracy. Our professor's criticism is evidently not only without support in real information, but betrays also a hostile prejudice that has not so much as stopped to meditate before writing.

VII. The Charge of Being Lunatics

"These people who believe the Bible word for word, who cross every t and dot every i as they do in a certain seminary in this city are lunatics."

One cannot but regret that men will caricature the opinions of others and then ridicule them and regard such displays of prejudice as a sign of learning. This criticism asks for no answer. It is a painful manifestation of the prejudice and intolerance that so often characterizes the college class room. The fact of the matter is every man approaches truth with a certain set of pre-suppositions. If his pre-suppositions are naturalistic, he will be anti-Christian. If his pre-suppositions are personalistic, he will be cordial to the Christian faith. Every man approaches truth with pre-supposition, and the probability is the man who denies them the most vehemently is apt to hold them the most dogmatically.

Personally we plead guilty to pre-supposition. Our whole point of view of truth starts out with a firm and clearly defined belief in the freedom and transcendence of the human personality. Against this background the ethical supernaturals of the word of God are not difficult.—*H. P. S.*

At the devil's booth are all things sold;
Each ounce of dross costs its ounce of gold;
'Tis Heaven alone that is given away;
'Tis only God may be had for the asking.

—*Lowell*

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A.,D.D.

Too many Interrogation Points

Yes, we put too many topics in the form of questions. It is better to make clear and positive statements, because the question form stirs doubt right at the start. This thought has come to us through an editorial in the *Presbyterian*. This is a part of what it says:

> Thus we see the topic, "Is there a God?" instead of "The Existence of God." We have noticed the topic, "Can We Believe the Bible to be True?" instead of "The Absolute Truthfulness of the Word of God." Sometimes we see: "Is it still Necessary to Carry on Foreign Missions?" instead of "Our Changeless Duty to Carry Out the Great Commission." In the positive statement of the topic we teach the lesson in the first intimation; while, in the interrogative form, we call the whole matter in question, and open up the way for doubt with the very first words we speak.

A Comprehensive Faith

One of our contemporaries tells us what Dr. Francis L. Patton looked upon as the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. This is the way he put it: "Incarnation, expiation, resurrection, ascension—without these there is no gospel." Let us see just how this must be so. Without the incarnation of the Son of God we would be left in darkness as to God's plan for our salvation. Without his expiation on the cross God could not uphold the principle of justice and save man in an ethical and spiritual way. Without His resurrection He would not be the completely living Saviour and would have left the world in doubt as to His Messiahship. Without the ascension He would not have been glorified and given power to convict and convert the world of humanity. The Holy Spirit was sent from the exalted, glorified, all-powerful Redeemer.

A Religion of Vast Magnitude

This refers to the Christian religion—the religion of Christ, according to the Bible. It is not a humanly discovered religion, but a divinely revealed religion. And why is it a religion of such vast magnitude? For a number of reasons. The first of them is this: It reveals God and puts man in happy fellowship with Him. But who is God? He is the eternal and infinite Being. He is eternal because there must be something that has always existed; for if there ever was a time when there was nothing existent, nothing could have ever come into existence. Now, the only being who has existed from eternity is God, because all other entities of which we know anything are finite, and hence came into existence in time. Then, God must be infinite; for, being eternal, there would be nothing to limit Him. Thus we see that the Christian religion has to do with the infinite, eternal and ultimate Being—God. For that reason it is as high, deep and broad as infinity and as perduring as eternity. Yes, it is a religion of vast dimensions.

From Another Viewpoint

From another viewpoint the Christian religion is one of vast magnitude. First, it has promise of "the life that now is" (1 Tim.4: 8.) "He that believeth on the Son of God *hath* eternal life." It is a religion of the present tense as well as of the future. Christian people are practical folks. They do not sit down idly and dream about the glories of the future life, albeit they anticipate such a life with much joy. True Christian ministers are not mere sky-pilots. They are earth-pilots as well; they tell us how to behave ourselves in this life more frequently than they expatiate on the life to come. Yet, while all this is true, the Christian religion does not stop with this temporary mundane existence. It also has "promise of the life which is to come." It does not say, as does the materialist, "It is all of life to live and all of death to die." No! it opens up to the vision of true believers the gateway of an eternal and glorious futurity. Surely a religion which has "promise of the life that now is and also of that which is to come," cannot rightly be called a narrow and contracted affair, worthy of only people of small minds. Magnitude! that is a blessed characteristic of the Christian religion.

The Doctrine of Man

The religion of the Bible teaches a great anthropology, which is the doctrine of man. It makes provisions for the temporal and eternal welfare of man in the totality of his being. It has a great doctrine of the human

body. It tells us how wonderfully God fashioned (*yatsar*) it (Gen.2:7); that the Son of God assumed a human body when He became incarnate for man's salvation; that He raised it from the dead and bore it to the right hand of the Majesty on high; that our own bodies shall be resurrected and glorified at the second coming of Christ. Christianity also teaches the need of intellectual culture, and is the friend of true knowledge, saying: "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding." Wherever Christianity goes, it builds a church and a school-house side by side. But the Christian religion does not cut off a man's head above the eye-brows, and thus make a torso out of him. It recognizes the fact that man has an uppermost story to his triple being, and that is the crowning faculty of his soul, the spiritual faculty—the faculty with which he holds fellowship with God and angels and "the spirits of just men made perfect." Here again in its doctrine of man Christianity proves itself a dimensional religion; or, to put it somewhat colloquially, "It is a big religion for people of all sizes."

Christ Opened the Door of the Future

The secularist may try to keep us from thinking of the future by saying that we should confine our attention and interest to the present life and get as much out of it as we can while it lasts. But in spite of such teaching, man cannot help prying into the future. He feels that the poet was right when he said: " 'Dust thou art, to dust returnest,' was not spoken of the soul." On this matter the *Sunday School Times* has a good word to say:

> We see our Lord transcendent as to the source and giver of life. He alone answered the question of the ages, "If a man die, shall he live again?" Science answers, "Man *may* live again." Philosophy: "Man *hopes* to live again." Ethics: "Man *ought* to live again." But the Lord Jesus said: "Man *shall* live again and forever." "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

Science and the Changing Order

Among the living French scientists, Pichot is listed as "an eminent hydrographer," which means one who is versed in "determining and making known the conditions of navigable waters, charting coasts, rivers, etc." That is according to our lexicon. This is what *Figaro,* a well-known French journal, reports Pichot as broadcasting relative to changing science:

> We have seen theories, accepted without dissent, crumble as empires crumble. Of the whole beautiful edifice, built solidly upon great and accepted principles, of which the science of the nineteenth century boasted, there remains nothing but the ruins. Theories disappear before new theories. The electromagnetic nature of matter, the spontaneous disintegration of atoms, the absurdity of relativity, finally the disconcerting revelation of the discontinuity of all natural phenomena, in violently shocking our accepted theories, have definitely ruined the self-assertive authority of common-sense philosophy, and laid bare the insignificance of Voltairean persiflage.

The Status of Evolution

According to Ernest Gordon, writing for the *Sunday School Times,* the well known Dr. Zwemer did not give evolution much of a "send-off" in his inaugural address as professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. He quoted two scientists, Alkema and Bezemer, of the University Utrecht, Holland, as saying:

> The study of primitive religion has been altogether too much swayed by the hypothesis of evolution, and those who wrote on the subject approached it with prejudgments. . . . The fact is that the evolutionary theory as an explanation of the history of human thought is more and more being abandoned. Even as a working hypothesis it is to be condemned.

Then Dr. Zwemer quotes Professor Huizenga, of the same University, as insisting that "the evolution theory has been a liability, and not an asset, in the scientific treatment of the history of civilization."

Further Significant Testimony

In the same article we read that Dr. Zwemer cited a list of scientific men of continental Europe who are opposed to the evolution hypothesis. Among others, he cites a French scientific treatise on polytheism and fetishism, in which the following facts are brought out, quoting from Dr. Zwemer:

> The author speaks of five elements in the religion of primitive tribes in West Africa impossible to explain save on the assumption of a primitive revelation. These are: an organized family life; a name for a supreme Power, sovereign and benevolent; a moral sense of truth, justice, shame, and a knowledge that there is good and evil; the idea of soul, and the conviction that this soul does not die with the body's death; and, lastly, communion with the unseen Power by prayer and sacrificial rites. "Before such considerations the hypothesis of a primi-

tive revelation takes on every appearance of truth." (The last sentence is quoted directly from Dr. Zwemer).

Three Notable Bible Chapters

One of the excellent books that we have received for review (see our review department) is Dr. W. Y. Fullerton's *God's Intention*. This author furnishes the following information:

> Calvin tells us that every man should be familiar with at least three chapters of the Bible. The third chapter of Genesis to see how man fell; the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans to see the extent of the disaster, the horrible pit and the miry clay to which the road he took led him; and the third chapter of the Gospel according to John, to see how God lifted him out, put his feet on the rock again, and established his goings.

The Book of Esther

We have found something so good in the book previously named that we are going to capture it for our readers:

> It has often been said that the name of God is not to be found in the book of Esther; but God Himself is there, as He is often present today when he is least confessed. Underneath the title of the book in one of my Bibles I have written, with memory of Jacob's words at Bethel, "Surely the Lord is in the book, and I knew it not."

The Bible Reveals God

A liberalistic young minister, in his correspondence with the editor of the *Sunday School Times,* expressed his conception of the Bible in this way: "The Bible to me is a historical production of the religious experience of the Jewish race seeking for God." One cannot help wondering whether this young minister ever really studied the Bible. Where does it represent the Jewish race as seeking for God? On the face of it, the Bible is record of God's revelations of Himself and His will to the Jewish people. Long before there was such a race, God revealed Himself to our first parents in the garden of Eden. The Bible does not represent them as coming into existence and then trying to find out who created them; but immediately after their creation, God revealed Himself to them and gave them His first commandment (Gen.1:26-28). The Bible records no evidence that the Hebrews in their Egyptian bondage were seeking God, but tells us that God directly revealed Himself to Moses and then to the Hebrew people. Interpreters of the Bible should be accurate in their representations of what it really teaches. They should not read into it their subjective ideas.

A Record of Divine Revelations

The young minister just referred to does not believe that "the Bible is the inspired word of God" (this is his own language), but that it is a record of "the religious experiences of the Jewish race." This is eisegesis, not exegesis. According to the direct teaching of the Bible itself, it gives a record of God's revelations to certain chosen patriarchs and prophets. God came to Abraham and spoke to him directly. Likewise to Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Elijah, Isaiah, Amos, and the rest. Of course such theophanies must have produced a certain experience in the recipients, but their experiences are not the chief matter; the divine revelations made to them are the chief matter. The prophets were not to relate their experiences to the Jewish people, but were to tell them what God had said to them. Take, for example, the book of Leviticus. The first verse reads: "And Jehovah called unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tent of meeting, saying." Now go through the book, and note that the same statement, with slight differences of verbiage, is placed at the beginning of the following chapters: 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27; while the same statement frequently occurs in addition, within many of the chapters. Yes, the Bible, according to its own teaching, is primarily a book of divine disclosure. Experiences are results, not causes.

But the Bible Speaks of Seeking

Some one may reply that the Bible speaks of seeking. That is true. But we can think of no instance in which it says that the Jewish race were seeking by an inner urge to know whether there is a God or not. Sometimes in their affliction they called upon God to deliver them, but in such cases they were calling upon the God of whose existence they had been assured by His previous revelations. When the prophet exhorts, "Seek ye the Lord while He may be found," the very injunction implies that God is and that He may be found. Thus it is a revelation of God and His willingness to pardon and to bless. Moreover, the prophet spoke out of his own knowledge of God who had revealed Himself to him. When our Lord said, "Seek, and ye shall find," He was speaking of seeking mercy and pardon from the God whom He

had revealed to them as the gracious and forgiving God. It is not the seeking that begets the experience of God; it is God's revelation that begets the experience.

Bishop Moule's Wise Saying

"A Christ who is not God would be a bridge broken at the farther end." This wise epigram is attributed to Bishop Moule. Of this truth we may be sure—a mere human being could not save the world from sin. His example, however perfect, could not cleanse the heart from the defilement of sin nor free men from its bondage. Moreover, if God would forgive sin without expiation, He would Himself violate the eternal principle of justice upon which the government of the universe rests. "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of His throne." But if expiation for the sins of the whole world had to be made, only a substitute who is both God and man could accomplish it. He had to be human to suffer as man and shed His blood on the cross; He had to be God to give infinite value and efficacy to His vicarious sacrifice.

The Right Kind of Backward Movement

In these days we hear so much about "backward movements." And, of course, in every right way we ought to move forward. We want more spirituality, more faith, more zeal, more knowledge of the inexhaustible treasure we have in Christ and the Bible. But there is also a call today for a backward movement. In an address at Ocean Grove, N. J., Bishop A. J. Moore, of the Southern Methodist Church, declared substantially that "what we need is a backward movement," and by this he meant, back to the Bible as the inspired Word of God, "the only infallible rule of faith and practice;" back to Jesus without any doubt as to His deity; back to the cross as the only way of deliverance. We rejoice in such clarion testimony. Such a backward movement will give the best assurance of an unending forward movement.

Is not this Significant?

The *Sunday School Times* gives us information that we know our readers will appreciate. In Downe, Kent, England, Charles Darwin, the evolutionist, established a public reading room. But it was frequented very little by the villagers. Mr. J. W. C. Fegan, an earnest evangelist, wrote to Mr. Darwin and asked him whether he might use the reading room for a week's mission. The following is Mr. Darwin's reply, granting the request:

> You ought not to have to write to me for permission to use the reading room. You have far more right to do it than I have, for your services have done more for the village in a few months than all our efforts for many years. We have never been able to reclaim a drunkard, but through your services I do not know that there is a drunkard left in the village. Now may I have the pleasure of handing the reading room over to you?

The moral of the story is self-evident. *Verbum sat sapienti!* If you want to read about Mr. Fegan and his mission, send for his biography, written by Dr. W. Y. Fullerton, and published by Marshall, Morgan & Scott, London, England. The price is 2s. 6d.

God's Throne and Footstool

A noted scientist—that is, physicist—whom we have been reading, reiterates the old and hackneyed allegation that the Bible teaches the geocentric view of the universe. We wonder how often that charge has to be denied and corrected before these highly educated people will discover the truth about the matter. We open the Bible almost at random, and our eyes fall on Isaiah 66:1, which reads: "Thus saith the Lord, Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." If heaven is God's throne and the earth is only His footstool, how can the earth be the center of the universe, or even of the solar system? Surely the God who created the universe and who reigns over it would not establish His throne away off one side of His creation. Of course, the term "throne" is a figure of speech, but it must mean the center of God's dominion from which He rules. We maintain that there is plenty of evidence that the Bible teaches that our mundane sphere is part of the suburbs of the universe, and is not its center. The Bible does not even teach that the universe is heliocentric, because it is not, but teaches that the universe is theocentric.

Are Man and the Earth Important?

If, then, the earth is only a suburb of the material universe, is it of much importance, and is its main denizen, man of any great value? We reply with an emphatic affirmative. A planet does not need to be very bulky

to be of great qualitative importance, just as a small diamond is of more value than a large common rock. The very fact that God chose this earth of ours as the habitat of sentient and self-conscious personalities, and also as the *locale* of His redemptive work and sacrifice, stamps it as a planet of vast importance in His eyes. Man, as a sentient and self-conscious being, created in His image, is also of infinite value. Nor does he need either a colossal body or a vast planet in order to develop his personality. In a recent book we find these golden words from Michael Pupin, the great scientist:

> Our mother earth is a tiny dust speck in the material universe, but as the home of the creative soul of man it becomes the crown of creation.

To all the physical scientists of the world this important truth should be proclaimed: "Quality counts for more in God's universe than does quantity!" Try to get that truth into your minds.

Christ's Estimate of One Person

If ever you are tempted to say, "I am only one individual among millions and billions; so of what significance am I?" remember our incarnate Lord's appraisement of just one person. In the midst of a vast crowd pressing upon Him, He stopped to heal the poor woman with a physical infirmity. As He was going through Jericho, with a great concourse of people following Him, He stopped the whole procession to open the eyes of a blind beggar. He "must needs" go through Samaria because there was a woman at Jacob's Well whom He must save. He took little children up in His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. Then listen to His application of the parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin: "Likewise I say unto you, There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Paul echoed Christ's teaching when he wrote: "He loved *me,* and gave Himself for *me.*" And, be it remembered, such an estimate of one's value is neither egotism nor egoism; it is a recognition of God's stamp of eternal value on a single self-conscious and sentient personality.

Was there a Deutero-Isaiah?

To those who believe that the second part of Isaiah (Chapter 40-66) was not written by Isaiah, but by some unknown person about 180 years later, we have a few words to say. It is the position taken by Dr. S. D. Gordon in his series of *Quiet Talks* books. We want to show what peril there is in such a doctrine. Let us look at John 12:37,38: "But though He had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on Him; that the word of Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" The quotation is from Isa.53, which is clearly attributed to "Isaiah the prophet." Note John 12: vs.39,40: "For this cause they could not believe, for that Isaiah said again, He hath blinded their eyes," etc., which is a quotation from Isa.6:9,10. So the apostle John attributed both Isa.6 and Isa.53 to the Prophet Isaiah. Was St. John divinely inspired when he wrote his gospel or was he not? It would be well for evangelical believers to ponder these matters. Many other New Testament passages are just as much to the point, as we will show in the next paragraph.

New Testament References to Isaiah

The following are some of the New Testament references to the so-called Second-Isaiah. Matt.3:3, which is spoken of as fulfilling Isa.40:3. Matt.8:17 is the fulfillment of Isa.53:4. Look up Matt.12:17f., and note its fulfillment of Isa.42:1f. Compare the following parallel passages: Luke 3:4 with Isa. 40:3; Luke 4:17 with Isa.61:1ff; John 1:23 with Isa.40:3; in Acts 8:27,28 the Ethiopian eunuch was reading from Isa.53:7; Rom.10: 16 is said by Paul to fulfill Isa.53:1; Rom. 10:20 fulfills Isa.65:1. Let it be noted that all these fulfillments are attributed to Isaiah, and are found in that part of the book which the liberalistic critics declare was not written by Isaiah, but by some unknown party. It is significant, too, that Paul, in Rom.10:11, cites Isa.28:16 as "Scripture." Also in Rom. 10:27 Paul names Isaiah and refers to Isa. 10:22. Thus Paul and other New Testament writers recognize only one Isaiah.

The Relation of the Gospels to One Another

Is there conclusive evidence that Mark's gospel was written first and that Matthew and Luke copied largely from it? Why would Matthew, who was an apostle under the direct tutelage of Christ, have to borrow from Mark, who was not an apostle? In the Janu-

ary-March number of the *Bible League Quarterly,* London, England, we find a critical article by Rev. A. A. Finn, in which the theory above indicated is dealt with in a thorough-going way:

> That theory rests wholly on the fact that in many places the wording of all three is identical or nearly so. But a thorough comparison of the passages where all three can be compared (and the writer has done this very carefully) shows that this identity of wording is mainly confined to utterances, chiefly those of our Lord Himself. At the same time the wording and character of the narratives of the incidents varies so constantly and greatly that there can have been no such copying. They must have come from independent writers.

The Authors of the Synoptics

In the excellent article named above, by Mr. Finn, he presents the reasons for the similarities and differences among the synoptic gospels in a way that seems to be convincing:

> Then as to the authors. St. Matthew (if the first gospel came from him) was an eye-witness of much that he narrates; St. Mark has his knowledge chiefly from St. Peter, also an eye-witness; St. Luke informs us (1:2) that he was at pains to get his information from those who were themselves eye-witnesses. It is inevitable that such histories would have much in common, even down to some identity in wording, and yet retain their own characteristics, just as we find in these gospels.

Is not that view most reasonable? And it agrees with the historical situation as set forth in the gospel narratives themselves. It also accords with our Lord's promise that the Holy Spirit would guide His apostles into all truth.

The Bible a Supernatural Book

According to its own testimony, the Bible is certainly a supernatural book. The supernatural element pervades it through and through. Therefore the modern attempt to accredit it to a human source, or to human sources, is a direct contradiction of its own testimony. A writer in the *Fundamentalist,* an English publication, has something relevant to say on this matter:

> On every page of the Bible the claim is made, either by implication or direct statement, that the Bible is the Word of God. The divine name occurs about ten thousand times. The book of Exodus contains 1,103 verses; God's name occurs 470 times, and 579 verses are said to be spoken by Him. Jeremiah contains 1,314 verses, in which God's name occurs 333 times, and of which 914 verses are said to be spoken by God. Are Moses and Jeremiah telling the truth when they use the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," or, "The Lord spake unto me, saying"? That is a plain question; and what is true of Moses and Jeremiah is true of all the Old Testament prophets.

Another Error Punctured

A British Modernist, in a recent book, asserts that the writers of the Bible, both the Old Testament and the New, did not write with the idea that their compositions would be treated as canonical. We are wondering just how the liberalistic critics, who make this statement over and over again, know that it is true. Where is there any documentary or other evidence to indicate what the Biblical writers thought about the canonicity of their writings? We fear this claim is made by the critics for the purpose of creating doubt regarding the inspiration of the Bible. What difference does it make, anyway, what the Biblical writers thought about canonicity? Not one particle. But surely the Holy Spirit, who moved and guided them in their writing, must have known that their productions would sometime be gathered together into a canon for the authoritative guidance of God's people. Moreover, if the Biblical writers knew that they were inspired of God, they may very well have known that they were writing what God wanted to reveal to the world; and that was all that was necessary for them to know. Of course, God did not reveal *everything* to them, but that is no reason for thinking that He did not reveal *anything* to them.

A Word About Doctrine

The reply of the editor of *The Evangelical Christian,* Toronto, Canada, to a critic pleases us greatly. The critic had said that "doctrine is necessarily a rut," or words to that effect. To this the said editor responds:

> We do not care for our brother's simile when he says that doctrine is necessarily a rut. We would rather say it is a road than a rut. And the King's highway has some breadth to it. It will take a car as well as a motorcycle.

Why should the great doctrinal system of Christianity be likened to a rut, which is narrow and cramping. Surely the doctrine of an infinite God, all-wise, all-powerful, personally interested in the rational creatures of His universe, the Creator, Preserver and Redeemer of the cosmos—surely that is not a small and narrow doctrine. Nor is a doctrine rut-like which gives promise of the life that now is and of an eternal destiny in the life to come.

Christian Evidence

Bishop H. M. DuBose, D.D.,LL.D.

Christianity and the Gladiatorial Shows

ROMAN civilization was essentially pagan. This paganism tended constantly to materialism, sensuality and cruelty. Roman cruelty found many channels of expression; but none more characteristic and inhuman than that of the gladiatorial shows in the arena at Rome and elsewhere in the empire. The history of these shows was coextensive with the first three and a half centuries of imperial rule, or from the reign of Augustus to that of Constantine. The custom is believed by some to be older than the life of Rome; but of this there is no certain proof. The first record which we have of a gladiatorial contest comes from the third century B.C., when Marcus and Decimus Brutus gave an exhibition at the funeral of their father. It was more than a century later that this precedent began to take general hold on the Roman mind. At first, gladiators were exhibited only at funerals; but gradually the sword contest came to be the chief pastime of the people. Indeed, the training of fighters for the arena developed into a profession. Slave owners and professional trainers furnished slaves for the arena. For a long times, slaves only were trained for this immolation; but finally it came to have such fascination for the brutalized public fancy that representatives of all classes volunteered to enter. Even Roman senators, and sometimes women, trained for these shows.

Julius Caesar provided a gladiatorial carnival in which six hundred and forty slaves fought to the death. With this license, the arena and the public gardens became shambles of human slaughter. Many public men, especially those seeking office and other popular favors, entertained their constituencies with these ghastly sports. It was a direct path to political popularity.

But it was the emperors themselves who, with these orgies, fed the public craving for blood. Augustus, indeed, made an effort to curb it, and decreed that only two such contests should be had within a year; also that gladiatorial shows should not be given by any private citizen whose wealth was not rated at a half million sesterces; but even the will of the greatest of the Caesars did not avail; and the emperors who came after him vied with each other in the length and bloodiness of the games which they staged. Trajan gave a spectacle of one hundred and twenty-three days, in which two thousand men slew each other, or were torn by wild beasts, for the entertainment of eighty thousand spectators, patricians and plebeians

It was after the erection of the Flavian Colosseum, which was begun by Vespasian and finished by Titus, in A.D. 80, that the arena became the exclusive center of gladiatorial shows in the Capital. Titus opened the Colosseum with a hundred days of onsets of sword against sword, and the fighting of men with wild beasts. In these days, the gladiators were chiefly captives taken in the numerous wars carried on in the provinces. Doubtless, hundreds of Jewish captives destroyed each other, or were devoured by wild beasts, in the carnivals of Titus. Later, when the Christian persecutions came on, under Domitian and Trajan, thousands of the children of the church were given to beasts in the Colosseum. Tradition says that St. Ignatius was thrown, by order of Trajan, to lions in the arena; but at what date is not clear.

We are now prepared to study the gladiatorial games as they are related to Roman life and civilization, and as they finally were outlawed by Christianity.

1. These games were a quality of Roman civilization. The name comes from *gladius,* a sword, which was the true symbol of Roman power. Rome conquered with the sword and held her conquests in the same way. When the sword failed, she failed with it. It was but natural, therefore, that, when Roman life became obese with gluttony and debauched through sensuality, it should turn the sword on itself. It had drunk the blood of the na-

tions; in the drunkenness which followed, it thirsted to drink its own blood, or that of those helpless ones who had become incorporated in its own body. The mania of blood is as the mania of drink, only it is seven fold more. The tiger, with but a taste of blood, devours after the order of his brute instinct, not after his sense of hunger. It is so with the brute in man; a taste of blood causes his brutality to revert to type. When the veneer of civilization is scratched with the sword, the protoplasm below is seen to be red with the blood of savagery.

The arena expressed the absence from Roman civilization of an understanding of the sanctity of life. The sense of self-preservation was well developed in Rome; and the spirit of the social body made strong appeal; indeed, that was the bond that held intact the Roman life of the Seven Hills that ruled the world. But there was no recognition of the sanctity of life in itself, the concrete of being, the image of God in man. A slave was a chattel; a prisoner was a trophy of war. There was no tenderness within to plead; there was no law without to constrain. The story of Parrashius and his Olythian slave, fable though it likely is, illustrates the inhuman egoism of the Roman mind at this later time. What was a slave for but to be tortured, and to die, for his master's fame or his master's pleasure?

This was quite in line with the absence of any recognition of the unity of the race. It was the lack of that ennobling thing which we seek to describe when we use the word *humane* as a qualitative adjective. It is the absolute antithesis of that which lies nearest the heart of the gospel; it is ignorance of man, made more precious than fine gold, even the gold wedge of Ophir. But Roman civilization did not know this, because it did not know God. How could it know the image, if it did not know the Maker?

We have seen that the depth of spiritual poverty in Roman civilization was sounded in the fact of its lack of any sense of altruism. The word *brother* was a term of consanguinity only; and its derivative *brotherhood* had no meaning outside of the fanciful ventures of certain poets, or the academics of forgotten philosophers. The soul of Rome lived in a nightmare of carnage; malevolence was the average of its vices; and the arena was its vocalized contempt for the human race.

The finally confusing and fatal element in Roman civilizaiton was its ignorance of a punitive divine law. There was a foreboding of shades in the realm of spirits, as there was a hope of possible sensibility somewhere beyond the Stygian gloom; but there was no knowledge of a judgment to come; no time when the books should be opened, and another book should be opened, and when the dead, both small and great, should be judged by the things written therein. In the absence of this belief, the arena, with its bloody horrors, went by default. Where there is no hell there is no terror of justice or judgment.

2. The gladiatorial show came, at last, to type the soul of Rome. From being a quality or integrant of Roman life, it came to engross and express that life. The most prodigious single creation of antiquity, aside from the Great Pyramid, was the Colosseum. In ruins, it is still amazing, overwhelming. The Colosseum was moral Rome, as the Great Pyramid was religious Egypt. The Colosseum had but one use; it was the empire's altar of blood. The infection ramified the imperial body. We have rather scant material upon which to determine the case, but it appears that there were gladiatorial arenas in almost every important city in the empire. Certainly, there were such at Ephesus, Antioch, Corinth, Lyons, and Gerassa in Palestine.

Thus urban Rome gave her image to the conquered peoples about her. What she was, she made her subjects to become. Indeed, this leaven of Roman barbarism lingers in some manifestations of modern civilization, despite the correctives of Christianity. In the Iberian Peninsula, where was the most Roman-like of Rome's patrician colonies, and where are spoken today the most Latin-like of the Romance tongues, the brutality of the arena survives in the milder likeness of the Spanish bull fight; as it does in the underworld of America in the pugilistic prize ring.

3. The arena and its degrading shows grew with the life of Rome. Like a cancer in the body, it fed on the vital tissues. It was fatalism translated into morals. Recovery was impossible. There was nothing regenerative or self-restorative in the moral consciousness of that old civilization. Only the formula of Buddha, annihilation, could end the rage of its vast desire for carnage. The gladiatorial horror began to diminish only as

the life of the empire began to fail. When a sword was brandished from without, then Rome began to wipe its own sword of familiar blood. When a ruder barbarism stormed from the north, then the barbarism of the south began to swoon for the new and unaccustomed letting of blood. An undreamed of judgment in the heel of the Vandal took penalty where there had been no thought or fear of the judgment of Jehovah.

But, after all, it was only when spiritual might out of the Sepulchre of Joseph began to speak righteousness and truth, so that the people heard, that the arena became a ruin and the holocausts of blood became a memory. It is to this point that our discourse is now drawn.

4. The arena, with its shows of blood, disappeared only under Christian influence and ascendency. In 325 A.D., Constantine, the first Christian emperor, by decree, abolished gladiatorial contests of every kind. But it was, at last, only the moral power of Christianity that completely ended the barbarism. Clandestine and lawless exhibitions took place in many cities, and in Rome itself, during the reign of Constantine and his immediate successors. In the reign of Honorius, 395 A.D., Telemachus entered the arena to put an end to a contest which was being staged, when he was stoned by the populace. Quite forcibly, this reminds us of what is happening today in America, in connection with the enforcement of our temperance laws. By 500 A.D. the gladiatorial shows had become a memory, in fact. Christianity had wiped out the most monstrous shame of antiquity.

Can there be found in all history a more certain evidential argument for the divine message and influence of Christianity than in its successful contest with the arena and the morbid, sensual and murderous civilization which it represented? This record should be an encouragement to Christian workers in every field of endeavor and reform. The powers of evil endure through futile forces, expressed, for the moment, in accident or arrested progress. The powers of truth and righteousness are eternal and self restorative. Our charter and our assurance is the Written Word which is being vindicated and testified to on every newly entered page of history.

Nashville, Tennessee

Current Scientific Discoveries

Professor George McCready Price, M.A.

What History says about Darwin

WITHIN the last few years, five large scholarly works have been issued which deal with the history of science. One was by Sarton (1927), one by Nordenskiöld (1928), one by Rádl (1930), one by Dampier-Whetham (1930), and the latest by Prof. Charles Singer, *The Story of Living Things,* the American edition of which appeared only a few months ago, being issued by Harper & Bros.

All of these histories of science are thoroughly different in their tone from such works as the notorious 2-volume *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology,* by Andrew D. White, which so obfuscated the minds of many during the closing years of the nineteenth century. In these modern works, which are genuine histories, and not merely propaganda stuff for the evolution philosophy, White's imaginary "warfare" between science and religion is conspicuous by its absence. And withal they serve to give a picture of such men as Darwin, Spencer, and Haeckel, very different from that eulogistic picture which was so industriously circulated by their evolutionary partizans during the period of the triumph of Darwinism. Even long after these major prophets of the modern apostasy had been dead and gone, there seemed to prevail the sentiment: *De mortuis nihil nisi bene;* so that until very recent years it has been very difficult to find in scholarly works an accurate estimate of these men and their real place in the history of scientific progress.

I do not have the space to deal with what

these other modern historians have to say about Darwin and his associates; I can give only what Singer says about Charles Darwin. But Nordenskiöld and Rádl might be quoted to the same effect; for these men live on the Continent of Europe, the one in the university of Helsingfors and the other in the University of Prague, and so are somewhat outside that direct circle of English nationality which has often blinded the eyes of the people of Great Britain. For outside the comparatively small circle of those fanatics who worshipped at the shrine of Haeckel's Monism, the trained scientists of the Continent never did become very enthusiastic about Darwin's pet theories. But Charles Singer is a professor in the university of London; his special work is that of teaching the history of science in one of the colleges of that largest of English universities. So it is cheering to know that even the people of England are at last awaking from their long trance under the hypnotic spell of Darwin.

I shall quote with but brief comment from this the latest and one of the most readable of these modern histories of natural science.

> In November 1859 appeared Darwin's great book, the *Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection.* Despite its great value and stimulating character and despite the conviction that it carried, its arguments are frequently fallacious. It often confuses two distinct themes. On the one hand there is the question whether living forms have, or have not, an evolutionary origin. On the other hand is the suggestion that Natural Selection is the main factor in Evolution. These themes can be and should be discussed independently. In the *Origin* they are inextricably confused. (p.298).

As I have pointed out in my *Scientific Blunders,* this inextricable confusion of thought was due to the fact that Darwin never was effective in subjects requiring abstract reasoning; and of course Darwin was in this book dealing with such subjects as "species" and "varieties," which, as Nordenskiöld expresses it, are among "the most abstract terms in biology and the most difficult to define" (*History of Biology,* p.469).

Singer next quotes a statement from Darwin to illustrate his charge of inextricable confusion. Darwin claimed that only *three* propositions need be admitted in order to establish his theory of Natural Selection; Singer quotes these three propositions as Darwin stated them, but adds:

> But this assumes that the "profitable deviations" are inherited. Thus not three but four propositions are needed. (p.298).

Singer then gives a long quotation from Darwin which is too long to reproduce here. But Singer's comments on this quotation are worth recording, and they can be understood and appreciated even apart from the direct words of Darwin. Singer says:

> There are here, as we can now see, a series of fallacies and some erroneous assumptions. (p.299).

He discusses these in considerable detail, but while eminently enlightening and accurate, I do not have the space to reproduce them here. It has not been my purpose to go into the details of this ancient discussion about "Natural Selection," which, as Hans Driesch remarked as long ago as 1902, had then been "dead for a long time." But I have given sufficient evidence that the modern historians of science are now showing that they are no longer afraid to speak out and tell the world just what position Charles Darwin really occupies in the history of science.

Darwin was always a confused thinker whenever he had to deal with the more abstract forms of scientific ideas. He was a patient gatherer of facts and examples; though after he had gathered these facts he became confused in trying to handle them, and he led astray the entire world by the interpretation he placed upon these facts. By fallacious reasonings and erroneous assumptions he induced the world to accept the general theory of organic evolution, because as was supposed he had discovered exactly *how* this evolution came about. We now know that his explanation of the *how* of evolution is totally mistaken. Nevertheless the world still goes on contentedly believing the conclusion of his reasoning after his reasoning itself has been discredited. We now hold to the evolution of animals and plants *somehow,* freely admitting that the explanations announced by Darwin are unsound and unscientific.

This is the situation today, in this fourth decade of the twentieth century. Evolution has become a great modern pagan religion; but those who have all along believed their Bibles regarding the origin of things ought to take courage from these recent statements of the history of science that this theory was saddled on the world by confused thinking and by arguments full of fallacies and erroneous assumptions.

Berrien Springs, Mich.

The Church in Europe

FREDERICK HASSKARL, M.A.,B.D.

The Word of the Living God

A NEWS item in *The Christian Century* entitled "Young Theologians at Basle" states in part,

The Conference was indeed dominated by the neo-orthodoxy which seems to be taking the younger theologians by storm. Barth and Heim in Germany, Brunner in Switzerland, Lecerf, the neo-Calvinist in France, the Anglo-Catholic theologians in England, have become the leaders of this next generation.

This statement is an agreeable corroboration of many paragraphs to be found in this department during the year 1931. It is quoted here, because it not only speaks of the sound theological trends in Germany, but of the other leading European nations. Indeed, one could also include the sturdy theology of Scandinavia as well as of the struggling Protestant minorities of the hinterland countries.

These facts add interest to Dr. Doehring's article "The Word of the Living God," begun in the February issue of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE and continued in this number.

The pastor of the largest Protestant Church in the world continues:

"Here a little historical reflecting is in order. Why did Martin Luther take such an exclusive and radical stand on God's Word? Certainly no one could ever accuse him as submitting to the 'dead letter of the Law.' Nevertheless he always based himself solidly on 'It is written,' 'Thus saith the Lord,' in the most difficult moments of his life,—a life filled with theological controversy.

"Indeed, we must go still further back. Why does even our Lord Jesus Christ so frequently call upon the holy Book of His Father's? It is a lamentably poor excuse to say that He did as One following the traditionally accepted 'dogmatical viewpoint.' The reason is clearly this: He knows that His Father in Heaven did not speak for the first time through Him. He knows above all things this also, that God has spoken His Last Word through Him. He is absolutely conscious that He is the *Incarnate Word* of God. Therefore, He gathers up within Himself all that God has had to say to mankind and ever will have to say. It follows then that Luther most rightfully could maintain, that all that is God's Word 'which deals with Christ.' (Luther's expression is: *'was Christum treibt.'* This jewel of the great Reformer is difficult to put into an English setting).

"So with this statement of Luther we come to the center of the matter, if we really want to hear God Himself speak. For this Christ does not speak, as it were, about God, or merely of God, but He brings His Father in Heaven to earth for mankind, so that there remains nothing else for mankind than to say 'Yes' or 'No.' If one but permits oneself to be put into this situation by Christ, one will affirm: No man can easily or lightly speak this 'yes.' And if one could, it would be totally meaningless. *For who says 'yes' to God, must say 'Father' to Him. And who desires to say 'Father' to Him, must become His child.* To this soul-depth one must open oneself to the Eternal God, if one really desires to hear Him speak. Christ was the Son of God, therefore He heard His Father speak. And Luther became just through this Christ a child of His Father in Heaven; therefore the Bible became the Word of God to him and he heard God speak in it.

"Accordingly let no one think, that it is a 'matter of viewpoint' to believe the Bible to be God's Word. Never. One can be a thousand times of the 'viewpoint,' that the Bible is the Word of God,—yet one does not hear God Himself speak! Indeed, what does Faith have to do with 'viewpoint'? Nothing, —absolutely nothing. Faith is Life and not merely viewpoint. Faith is Life in God and with God, child-like Life, which receives its very being from none other than from the Father in Heaven. In the divine sense of the word, this child's hunger is stilled by Him. It is a hunger, which always is aroused and always is felt, when one descends into the

very deepest depths of one's soul. The meeting with God then takes place, not high up in the brain, where man all too easily becomes the victim of the madness, that he is sufficient unto himself. For surely sooner or later he is bound to make the painful discovery, that all brain-functions and all their accomplishments,—which causes external amazement,—reveal at some point a tragic weakness: the heart lacks joy and solace! *'Viewpoints' are formed in the brain; on the other hand, the birthplace of Life is in the heart, or one may say, in the soul.*

"Here the Word of the living God does its mighty work. Hither the Saviour turns with the most divine of His Words, over against which all others are only variations of the One and selfsame theme—and that is the true theme of life—'Be of good cheer, my son, thy sins are forgiven thee!' *To whom this Word says nothing,* to whom *this Word does not say everything, he is unreceptive for the Original—language of God: He has not yet arrived at the last depths of his life's foundation.* He is simply splashing the water's surface and imagines that he can still solve the problem of life with the power of the brain. A hopeless Beginning as history and our sorry present prove."

The third part of Dr. Doehring's article deals with Man's Word and God's Word as they are applied to our own day and generation. It is a scathing rebuke to those who have left the Word of the Living God to serve at the world's tables. It is a masterful appeal to make the Word central, so that its mighty dynamics are enabled to save this tottering modern civilization. It will be translated for the next issue in this department. Meantime, let us ponder anew the Word:

"Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy Word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of mine heart."

Wilmington, Delaware.

Current Religious Thought

The Supreme Value of Truth

C. H. Buchanan, D.D.

CHRIST was the Prince of Peace, and his atmosphere was the spirit of love; yet there come occasions when even Christianity must needs be defended. And, if there ever was such a time we are living in it now. Why, then, should Christianity not avail herself of those means of protection which are made available for her benefit? Why, with its many strongholds of safety and means of defense, should she see her beauty despoiled and her prestige taken away? Are not the instruments of defense for the accomplishment of her purpose in the world without let or hindrance?

While for propaganda no other system can take the place of evangelism, nothing can win like love, yet for the more abundant harvest the farmer must clear the ground, burn the brush and blast out the stones, and, while this rougher work is not so joyous as seed sowing, it is equally as necessary in religion as in farming. And the time has come when some ground clearing is needed.

Christianity must be defended. This fact has always been imperative. It was even in the days and experience of Christ himself. He was never a belligerent soul, yet he did not hesitate to resort to polemics to make his teachings clear and to oppose his enemies. This fact was prominent in his temple discussions with his opponents. He knew the perverseness of human nature in taking the opposite views, and he was not blind to the spiritual interests of his spiritual kingdom in its future struggles with the world, hence he said to his disciples in organizing them for their destined work: *"He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one,"* —for the time of needed defense had come. While we interpret this injunction as applying to spiritual things, that need is uppermost in religion today.

There has never been a time when Christian polemics were not needful. While Peter's great sermon at Pentecost was largely evangelic, it had in it much that was defen-

sive, much which set the disciples of Christ right before the great multitude. Stephen's sermon at the time of his martyrdom was purely one of defense,—of his Master's cause and also of himself. Where in all Christian literature is there a greater dynamo for defense and propagation, or one that has done more to strengthen believers, than Paul's speeches before the rulers in his experience?

Some may be inclined to think that Paul was childish in oft-repeating his experience in his conversion before unsympathetic listeners. But those were facts which he knew, and which could not be gainsaid or refuted. It is still true that by the statement of such facts as are felt and known, Christianity is spread among men. Here was the once raging lion of a Saul of Tarsus, breathing out threatenings against the infant church, now as gentle as a lamb and giving his life in defense of what he once persecuted. A gospel that could save a Saul is able to save all sincere believers. Such facts even today need only proper statement before the world to produce their results. Some may want to hold that Christ won his way in the world by the principle of non-resistance, but the facts of history show that all down the centuries polemics have been resorted to, as in the days of the fathers.

Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria

Perhaps at no other time in all these years was there any greater need or greater benefit from Christian defense than in the case of Athanasius of Alexandria, in the fourth century. Arius, the proto-Modernist, then taught, and many were his followers. He held that Christ was only human, not divine, and one with the Father. Arius had been condemned and expelled by the Council of Nice, but recalled by a subsequent pagan emperor who played into the hands of the humanistic party, and he royally decreed that Arius should be received by the Church at Alexandria. But the heroic bishop stood his grounds and refused to admit Arius to the holy communion. Whereupon the Arians raised such a tumult and hatched up such defamatory charges against the bishop that a synod was called at Caesarea and Athanasius was summoned to appear and answer the charges preferred against him. These libelous charges were easily disproved. But others were trumped up, on which he was banished, but afterwards recalled. Still his Arian enemies pursued him, and later the Counsel of Milan again expelled him. This time he took refuge in the desert of Thebia, where he composed his masterly and immortal polemics, exposing the falsehoods of his enemies, strengthening the believers, and defending Christianity. The emperor, Julian, became so alarmed at the energy with which he opposed paganism that he recalled him. When other pagan emperors came to the throne Athanasius hid himself in his father's tomb for many months, till the Alexandrians took up arms in his behalf and compelled his restoration. After this he presided in his bishopric in peace till his death.

Twenty of his forty-five years of ministerial life he spent in banishment. In those years in exile, he, the noblest man of the age, did more to establish orthodoxy and vital Godliness and Christianity as it has come down to us, than any other living man. He did not "storm and strike," but stood firm for the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, as "the Son of God made man for us . . . so that we might appeal to this very fact by which religion is to be founded." He it was who championed religious liberty as against fatalism, and the divinity of Christ as against humanism, which doctrines gave us the Reformation and vital Godliness. Oh, for a modern Athanasius to lead the militant religious forces of our day and times!

The Work of Butler and Hall

Nothing is more tenacious of life than the spirit of unbelief. When one head is cut off the hydra-headed monster, another springs up somewhere else. The philosophy which caused the Reformation and awoke individualism, swung to the opposite extreme and produced rationalism. Men came to think that the human intellect was all-sufficient and to deny the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the Bible as the Word of God and highest authority was denied and the worship of Nature came into vogue. Men spoke glowingly of "rising up through nature to nature's God." Deism and French infidelity were in flower. Those were the days of Spinoza, Bolingbroke, Voltaire and David Hume. But, they were also the days of Bishop Joseph Butler, and later, Robert Hall and Bishop William Paley.

The fumes of French infidelity had their deadly effect on the Christianity of the times,

and the frivolity and corruption of the reign of Charles II had taken possession of the minds of the people. In 1736 Joseph Butler wrote:

> It has come, I know not why, to be taken for granted that Christianity is no longer so much as a subject of inquiry, at length being discovered to be fictitious, and nothing remains but to set it up as a principle subject of ridicule, by way of reprisal for having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world.

Warburton, in writing about the same period, said:

> I have lived to see the day when religion has lost its hold upon the minds of men.

But, had it? Was it not a fact that religion, then as now, needed only to be properly placed before the hungry-souled world? Then it was that Butler wrote his immortal *Analogy,* countering the objections of the deists to revelation by showing that the God of Nature was the same as the God of the Bible, and that the same objections to a revealed religion could be urged against natural religion. Today, two hundred years afterward, Butler's *Analogy* remains a standard in Christian polemics and presents arguments which have never been overturned.

After Butler came Robert Hall, the eminent Baptist divine, whose sermon on *French Infidelity* stands out as a star of the first magnitude. As a preacher Hall was unsurpassed in his day. Another preacher went from hearing a very poor sermon, saying: "Thank Heaven, now I can preach again." When asked what he meant, he said: "When I heard Dr. Hall I came away saying, *That was preaching,* mine is only noise. I could never try again. But since hearing this man, I can try again." One of Hall's friends on visiting him, found him rolling on the floor, writhing in pain—in the region of his kidneys, a disease from which he died. He was then preparing his great sermon on *French Infidelity.* That sermon lives, while the dronings of his adversaries are long since forgotten.

Then came William Paley, with his master polemics, his *Evidences of Christianity.* His argument from design as illustrated by a watch is unanswerable.

Infidelity in America

This blight, like many others, followed the emigrants to the New World, and in the early days of our country, became a popular fad. Franklin and Paine had long lived in France. Paine went with the infidel crowd, and by a mere accident escaped the Guillotine. He returned to America to find skepticism in the air. "Tom Paine Clubs" were organized in nearly all schools. Stephen Girard, in founding his College at Philadelphia, stipulated that no preacher should be allowed to enter the campus. This statement can be seen over the entrance gate today. Paine, after writing his *Crises,* sent the manuscript to Franklin to be read and criticized. The manuscript came back with this note attached: "My advice to you is never to have this printed and thus save much heartache. If the world is so bad with Christianity what would it be without it? For God's sake, Paine, do not unchain the tiger!"

Regardless of this wise advise, the *Crises,* with its scurrilous attacks on the Bible, was printed, and Paine's star went down in gloom. The people of Philadelphia shunned him. His benefits to his country were forgotten. He became an offense to the nostrils as he passed on the streets. He had alienated his many friends, even his best friend, Washington.

But, in those dark days the new star of Timothy Dwight arose—as President of Yale College. The new president was a staunch Christian, and from the beginning of his presidency, waged incessant war on skepticism. In sermon and chapel talk, he sent forth his fiery bolts against infidelity. Soon a revival of religion broke out, and as one who was a student, said: "It seemed that the whole mass of students would rush into the kingdom of heaven." Under the blows of Dwight, infidelity slunk away and hid its head, and many of the converts entered the ministry. All the flurry and furor of skepticism passed away under the championship of a true soldier of the Cross. The religious young preachers went out over the country, and the revival of 1800 broke out to spread over the land, and saved the Republic. This was as much due to Dr. Dwight's twenty-two years at Yale as to any other agency. Contrast this with the conditions said to exist today. It was recently told that the same college "has a professor from whose classroom no student ever leaves without becoming an atheist."

Peter Cartwright in Kentucky

While Dr. Dwight was winning victories over infidelity down east, men in the far-

southwest were waging the same warfare and winning like victories. As Peter Cartwright was making the rounds of his District in 1821, he came to Somerset circuit, in Kentucky, and found a campmeeting in progress, where a very eloquent preacher by the name of Carlisle was preaching to a very ill-behaved crowd of people. When it came the new presiding elder's time to preach, he amused them for a while with his comical experiences, then swung into a terrific attack upon the prevailing fad of the neighborhood. The night before he had learned much of the local condition, which was Arianism at large. This he attacked with all his fury. Cartwright was a giant in many respects. He was not afraid of man or devil; and when provoked, he could fight like fury, religiously or otherwise. When at his best he was a very great preacher, and on this occasion he was himself plus the Holy Spirit. For four hours the people sat spell-bound while he stormed the forts of Arianism and lovingly called souls to Christ. At length the storm broke, and souls wept aloud and cried for mercy, and shouted for redeemed joy. There was no more preaching that day or the next, and two hundred souls were converted. One hundred and seventy-five joined the Church there. Of this occasion, Cartwright said:

> Perhaps there was never a more manifest display of God's saving mercy on a small scale than on this occasion. . . . Many of the Arians returned to their old fold, weary of their wanderings. Those who remained among the New Lights, so called, split into many factions and fought each other till they were destroyed, down to the tail,—which was *immersion.*

That was a Hardshell community, (See Cartwright's *Autobiography,* pp.218-221).

In all this history we see the same agency prevailing,—the denial of the divinity of Christ, leading directly to infidelity and atheism. But atheism has never accomplished anything but discontent, revolution and self-destruction, such as has been scourging Russia of late.

While the skeptical lecturer may get the gawking crowd and leave the gospel minister the empty pew, all the world knows the results in the end. Mr. Ingersoll, the infidel, standing on the street in Peoria, Illinois, his home town, saw the Methodist preacher pass, and commiserated him, saying:

> Poor half-starved preacher! See his humble home, and his wooden church. Compare these with my lucrative law practice, my splendid office and that elegant mansion on that hill. In twenty-five years his Bible will be forgotten.

But, after that twenty-five years, what? Just opposite to where the infidel stood, there stands today one of the finest church structures in all the State. Where his splendid office stood there is now a magnificent Y. M. C. A. building, and on the hill that "elegant mansion" has given place to a large tobacco factory.

In the early days a company of men went from Virginia to Georgia, and took with them three things associated with Thomas Jefferson. (1) They took the name of Jefferson's home and established Monticello, Ga., the town in which they lived. (2) They took Jefferson's politics and formed a nest of Democracy in the South back in the Whig days. (3) They took with them Jefferson's skepticism (Unitarianism) and built up a nest of infidels which prevailed a great while. At last Atticus Haygood got tired of their infidelity, went down there and sailed into them in a series of discourses against infidelity, and all but one were converted. The sixth of those discourses Dr. Haygood worked up into his *Man of Galilee,* a small book which at once took its place among the polemic books in the defense of Christianity against infidelity.

While we remember that the greatest defense of religion is found in *living* it,—the unanswerable argument—yet Christianity is a rational system of truth, capable of intelligent presentation. When rightly declared and lived it is its own defense. Shall we who know its worth and have felt its power, sit in silence and see its beauty despoiled, its bulwarks destroyed, and its prestige lost? Answer, ye men of heroic mould who are filled with the spirit of Christ and his apostles and martyrs! Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: If Athanasius, Butler and Timothy Dwight could clear the air of skepticism in their day, and if Atticus Haygood could rout a nest of infidels in Georgia, and D. L. Moody by his great revivals could counteract the influence of Ingersoll, why cannot we with the same God, the same Christ and the same Holy Spirit, put to flight the armies of the aliens with their camouflaged infidelity masquerading under the banners of Modernism? Truth to say, *it must be done!*

Oh, for men of the Athanasius build to stand against the world! And men like But-

ler, Hall and Paley to put in array the instruments of Christian defense that men may protect the faith, or men like Dwight and Moody to awaken a revival wave to sweep the nation!

Richmond, Kentucky

The Plague of a Pernicious Press

William Judson Hampton, Ph.D.

MAKE friends of good books. He who does that, does well. A good book serves as a charming companion and an adorable friend. That man is almost to be envied who has a large circle of devoted friends. There are many thus blessed. The man without friends is to be pitied. A sorrow or a disappointment is soon shared by a sincere friend. How true to experience are the words of the sage, who said, "Friendship doubles our joys and cuts in twain our griefs."

A wise parent urges the utmost caution be exercised by children of the home in the selection of friends. It requires just as much caution to select as a companion and friend a good book, or magazine. Sone one has said, a good book is just as truly alive and speaks to us out of its pages, as is that friend alive who communes with us in private or in public. The book exerts a more subtle influence over us, than does a friend, for in most instances we unconsciously permit the book to do all the thinking, and talking. We pass under its magic spell as though some charm had been in use. A companion may lead to unhealthy thinking, and unhealthy thinking soon leads to unhealthy living.

An imagination soiled by the foul soot from some printed page will be difficult to remove. A good book is like the pure ozone from some healthy climate. It cleanses, inspires, invigorates, shapes and moulds a man's life. An individual, is, to a large extent, just what he reads. Then we need to begin with the young. Prof. William Lyon Phelps, of Yale University, said before 3,000 delegates to the American Library Association, held in Boston, in 1931: "It is better for children to read trash than nothing." Dangerous teaching, that.

> How quick soe'er a book goes thru' the mind,
> It leaves some gift, of gold or mud behind.

Secretary Wilbur of President Hoover's Cabinet, vigorously attacked the vulgar, sordid press as peril to the child, saying,

> Since a child is growing, developing all the while, not just when he is in the school room, or at home, we must think in terms of playmates, radios, moving pictures, books, magazines, good and bad,—all these as a part of his training process. *We have a foul nest to clean out in our vulgar, degrading magazines.*

Better be illiterate, than literate, with the mind inflamed by a corrupt literature. Sam Jones was right when he said, "I would rather have my child go to heaven without knowing his letters, than be able to read Greek in hell." This is the day of the best seller, and the best seller is much like the autumn leaf, fading in the same year it was born. We are told, only one book in one thousand lives five years, and only one book in twenty thousand lives one hundred years. Emerson said wisely, "That book lasts which deserves to last." In one of Emerson's lectures, quoted by President Rutherford B. Hayes, he says, "Read no book not a year old." What would happen to some of our best sellers were this rule to be adopted. Macaulay has given us these words,

> If any one would make me the greatest king that ever lived, with palaces and fine gardens, and wine and coaches, and beautiful clothes, and hundreds of servants, on condition that I would not read books, I would not be king. I would rather be a poor man living in a garret with plenty of books, than a king who did not love books.

Our scholar President, Woodrow Wilson, once said, "Of all the world's workers, those who take highest rank are the writers of noble books."

What do we as Americans read? We have a newspaper mind. The chief thing, and frequently the only thing in many an American home, is the newspaper. We have about 2,500 daily newspapers with a circulation of 31,000,000 and 15,000 weekly newspapers with a circulation of 50,000,000. From this one channel, we have a total circulation of 81,000,000. It is the day of the glaring, sensational headline in newspaperdom.

A prominent journalist was once asked, "What instinct makes a good newspaper

man?" The answer was shocking. "The instinct to know where hell will break out next." No wonder we have the glamor and glare of the modern headline, and that is the sort of mental bill of fare in many a modern American home! Hell breaking loose, here and there, and the public anxious to know about it in every sordid detail. No wonder when the mind is fed on such mental pabulum there is no desire for a cultural and religious press. The average reader is looking for dirt-in-ink in the morning and evening issues of our city dailies. That would be a dull paper, were a whole week to elapse, and no opportunity afforded to display in striking headlines the story of some kind of a hell breaking out somewhere.

A religious paper chronicles the experience of a mother who became alarmed, because she found one of her young daughters eagerly devouring the details of a sordid crime which had been reported in sensational detail in one of the newspapers. She told her daughter not to read such a paper. She cried a bit, and finally approaching her mother, said, "Please, mother, if I promise not to read any more of that hell stuff, may I read the paper?" That was sufficient for that mother. She determined that henceforth, no paper should enter her home, that published sordid details of crime, which would result in soiling, if not destroying, the beautiful chamber of imagery in the mind of her child. A leading religious journal published by her denomination was substituted instead.

We are told to look for

> Tongues in the trees, books in the running brooks,
> Sermons in stones and good in everything.

But the "good in everything" breaks down when search is made for it in the foul nest of the sordid, sex-ridden, passion provoking magazine or modern tabloid. The circulation of one of the most sensational sex magazines has reached a terrific figure. To name it, would advertise it, much like denouncing some salacious play.

A visit at the home of a prominent church official, disclosed the fact that no church periodical entered the home, but the son procured regularly the sex magazine already alluded to. In all likelihood, the father or mother knew nothing of the character of that magazine. But did that excuse them? They failed, because they had not furnished a high type of cultural and religious journal. If they had done that, they would have cultivated the desire for a high grade literature, and there would have been no desire for the sensational product.

In a survey of an Ohio town, it was discovered that out of 110 publications in a single store, 68 were either out and out smut or bordering on it. In a western town, 1,800 copies of a sex magazine are sold almost exclusively to women. The need today, in the world of literature, is for men of the type of Southey. He once said to Lord Byron, "In all my literary work, I have never manufactured furniture for a brothel." That was an honor of far more value than a peerage. Would that Lord Byron might have been able to say the same.

We pride ourselves on being a bookish nation. Are we? We may have books, but do we read them? We may have the Bible in our homes, but is it read? The American household consumes on an average four books a year. A survey of the school children of Cincinnati, Ohio, revealed the fact, that from homes from which reports had been received, 6% had no books at all; 16% had as many as 15. In other words, 22% or nearly one-fourth of the homes reported, either no book, or not over 15 were owned.

Religion in America, costs the people three-fourths of a cent on the dollar. Education costs one and a half cents on the dollar. Crime costs eight cents on the dollar. It costs about three times as much for crime as for religion and education, combined. Does a godless, sex-ridden, crime portraying press have anything to do with this?

We have 20,000,000 automobiles in America, against from three to five million in the rest of the world. On an average we have 20,000,000 people attending our moving picture theaters every night, for which they spend a round billion of dollars, in entrance fees. And we have more crime per capita than any other nation in the world. Folks either read trash, or find no time to read. Off working hours, America is either on the road, or in a theatre, where no independent thinking is required. No wonder a book or a periodical of a cultural value, pulsing with life, vital with truth, is pushed aside, and something either tame or insipid, dangerous or degrading is substituted.

How shall we counteract the influence of this winding sheet, filled with all sorts of unclean things, and which is dropped within the sacred portals of our homes? There are

those who say, Awake the churches to the evil; let the pulpits thunder against it; have teachers in our Bible schools, our seminaries and colleges, warn of the impending danger, by precept and example.

Well and good. We believe, however, the most effective way of combating this evil, would be to adopt a counter attraction. Fill the home, the library table, with a literature wholesome in moral and spiritual tone. A wise parent said, "I have five good reasons for taking a religious paper." He was asked to name them. He drew from his pocket a pocket book, and from that a photograph. The picture was that of a group of five lovely clear-eyed children. The group represented that man's sons and daughters. These constituted his five reasons. Could there be reasons more compelling and convincing?

Phillipsburg, New Jersey

Signs of the Coming Revival

As in the Day of Midian—A Wonderful Day

HENRY J. ZELLEY, D.D.

Below are two articles which have come to the Editor's desk. They bring with them messages of encouragement; signs of the coming revival.

THE Church of Christ from its birth at Pentecost, down to the present hour, has never been what its Divine Founder desired or expected it to be (read Jer. 32:35), yet it was "in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be" the whitest thing this side of the throne upon which the Eternal God is seated.

One of the greatest days in the history of the New Jersey Methodist Conference, was Thursday, December 10, 1931; and although it was not what it should have been, nor what God and His Christ desired or expected it would be, nor what the Holy Spirit was waiting to make it, if He had been given absolute control, yet it was a day which cannot be forgotten by those who were present and entered into the spirit of the meeting.

All the members of the Conference were invited by a circular letter, signed by the four District Superintendents, to a day of prayer and fasting for a great revival, and about one hundred and fifty of them met in the Centenary-Tabernacle Church, Camden, for that purpose. The day, from 10:30 A. M. to 3:00 P. M., was spent without intermission, in earnest prayer. While some apparently were not in sympathy with the object and methods of the meeting, yet all who were of one accord, were conscious of the Divine Presence. The prayers were "inbreathed" and consequently were effectual, and

> Heaven came down our souls to greet,
> While glory crowned the mercy-seat.

Confessions of neglect of the spiritual life, and of omissions of duty were made, and as the result the statement of 1 John 1:9, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," was again verified. At times shouts of praise were mingled with the intercessory prayers ot others. The burden of the prayers seemed to be "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me; and lead me in the way everlasting."

These prayers were answered. God not only turned His searchlight upon the honest suppliants, (and none others would have dared to offer such a prayer), making them conscious of their need, but also He revealed new beauty and attractiveness in the King's Highway. These men went out to "press with vigor on," and with a fixed determination to win for Christ, those for whom He died.

The manifest presence of the Holy Spirit gave proof that the God who answered by fire, still lives and gives the Holy Spirit "to them that ask Him." There were moments when the Holy Spirit swept through the assembly like the incoming waves of the sea; and many of the devout ones were singing in their hearts:

> O. the blessing and the power that the Lord gave me then,
> I never shall forget, I never shall forget;
> Even now 'tis stealing over me again and again,
> It lingers with me yet.

This meeting was called as the result of a series of prayer groups organized in different parts of the Conference by Evangelist Henry W. Bromley of Kentucky, through

the leadership of Rev. Carlton R. VanHook. To these groups we credited the numerous successful revival meetings previously held. We recall and name a few of these with the numbers of persons saved or restored: Penns Grove, 74; North Wildwood, 42; Pearsonville, 72; Mantua, 45; Petersburgh, 48; Centerton, 27; Buddtown, 11; Trinity, Trenton, over 200.

If the ministers resume their Spirit-directed group prayer meetings for revival, there is no doubt but their prayers will be answered, our churches filled with earnest seekers after Christ, our altars crowded with penitents, and the air once more vocal with prayer and praise.

Something great will happen soon,
I feel it in my soul;
And soon thro' ev'ry trusting heart,
The waves of pow'r will roll.

Something great will happen soon,
I see the cloud arise
That brings in this accepted hour,
Refreshing from the skies.

Something great will happen soon,
The earnest we receive;
O send the fullness of Thy grace,
The Holy Spirit give.

Something great will happen soon,
I feel it drawing near;
O hallelujah, praise the Lord,
The floods of grace are here.

Something great has happened now,
For since He made me clean,
Transgressors have been taught Thy way,
And souls are born again.

Yes! Something great has happen'd now,
Praise God for what I know,
Great waves of love from heav'n above,
Like ocean billows flow.

Asbury Park, New Jersey

The New England Church Survey

KATHRYN EVANS

THE purpose back of this survey of New England churches is threefold: We want to know where the most neglected places are; we want to know where churches were closed and why; we want to know whether there are any communities with no evangelical teaching in them. Also we want to become acquainted with evangelical leaders, especially Evangelical preachers, so that we can work with them.

Every report includes some figures. Here are some very telling ones from Merrimack County in New Hampshire. This county includes Concord, the capital, also several other cities as well as rural districts. The whole county has a population of 49,231. There are at present 81 evangelical churches operating in the county. These churches have a combined membership of 9,766 with an average Sunday attendance of 4,597. In other words, 9.36 per cent of the people in Merrimack County attend church once on Sunday. Where are the other 90.64 per cent? Only 33 of the 81 churches, considerably less than half, have any midweek service at all.

There are 24 closed churches in Merrimack County. Thirteen of these are still standing and could be used. Their property value is about $16,800.

It cost $162,410.78 to run these 81 churches. That was their budget last year. This does not mean that the 4,597 people contribute that much for the privilege of worship. The endowments in Merrimack County are in excess of $3,500,000.

One hundred and fifty persons were received into these 81 churches during the year 1930; but sixty-two of these joined one particular church. The spiritual significance of this gain may, however, be questioned. At the beginning of the year the pastor of this particular church decided that prayer meeting was not accomplishing anything. He abolished it and inaugurated a weekly dance in his church vestry. At the end of the season he had succeeded in getting 62 new members in his church.

Realizing that only about 10 per cent of the people are being touched by the religious life of the churches, we are faced with the challenge of the 90 per cent, and this is the challenge which we are seeking to meet through the Gospel of John Campaign, a national movement aiming to put a Gospel of John in every home in America. We were asked to undertake for New England.

A beginning was made in Grafton County in the town of Rumney. The pastor of the Baptist church called a special meeting of those who would like to help. Miss Elizabeth Evans met with them. Together they outlined the town and then she talked with them about personal soul winning, urging them to have prayer in the homes whenever possible. The results at the end of the first

day was amazing. Some of the ladies came home that evening in tears, deeply impressed with the reception they had received, and deeply ashamed that the work had not been done sooner. In one home, as the visitors read portions from the Gospel regarding the new birth and eternal life, the lady of the house turned to them and said, "Have you always believed these things? Why have you never come before? I have lived in Rumney twelve years and none of you have ever invited me to your services." The following Sunday there were people in the church whom the pastor had not seen in any service in years.

Campton became the center of activity the following week. Two churches there went into the undertaking with real enthusiasm. The young people's society in one church underwrote the expense of the gospels for half the town and the Women's Home Missionary Society of the other church for the other half. Men and women volunteered. One young woman said once she got started she found it easier than she expected. The large mill boarding house was visited. Miss Evans was allowed to place a gospel at each place at the table and then before the meal was served to talk to the men a few moments. Every room and every ward of the hospital was visited. Most of the visitors pronounced the work thrilling.

This same work is being done in one section of Connecticut, several places in Massachusetts, other towns in New Hampshire, as well as many places outside of New England. There is very little expense connected with it and the results are most gratifying.

Rumney, New Hampshire

But how about the 90 per cent in your community who are unchurched?—Editor.

A Precious Answer to Prayer

E. Delmer Mallory, D.D.

DURING a severe financial panic a corporation of which I was treasurer and manager, entitled Faith Missions at Home and Abroad, was just completing a large building in Boston to be dedicated to the service and worship of God. For reasons not necessary to mention, we were obliged to raise twenty thousand dollars on a mortgage on a property assessed for over sixty thousand dollars. In ordinary times this could have been done without difficulty, but in a panic it at first seemed impossible. Finally, through the influence of a prominent business man, a bank offered to take the mortgage. They engaged one of the shrewdest conveyancers of Boston to look up the title to the property, and to see if everything was right about our corporation.

Upon examination he found that the property had once been sold for taxes and had never been redeemed. To release it would require the signatures of three men, two of whom were now dead. He also found that our corporation, in electing its new treasurer and two other of its directors to fill vacancies, had done so in violation of its own by-laws, which required the votes of six directors to elect a new director; yet these three had had but five votes, which rendered their election null and void, and all the past transactions of the company requiring their votes were also null and void. As no other business could be transacted without their votes for a quorum, we were in a hopeless muddle.

Our attorney, who stood high at the bar, discussed the situation with the conveyancer, who was one of Boston's best lawyers, for about an hour without being able to find any solution to the problem, except that we put ourselves at the mercy of the courts, which at best would require weeks, if not months before any settlement could be reached. In the meantime, as the bank would not take the mortgage under the circumstances, there seemed nothing ahead of us but to have our new building sold in a panic for what it would bring in order to meet the urgent demands of the builders.

Leaving the lawyer's office I hastened to tell my wife I was going to take the first train to Canada, to lay the whole matter before my precious mother, who had the greatest and most blessed answers to prayer of any one I knew; for I felt sure if she could not pray us out, we would be swamped.

I arrived Tuesday morning, and the following Thursday morning about ten o'clock, mother came down stairs with face all aglow, and raising her right hand brought it down in the palm of her left hand, saying, "Delmer, you can go right back to Boston, for

God has just told me He will straighten that matter all out."

Neither mother nor I had one ray of light as to how God would help us, but I believed absolutely He would, and so returned to Boston in perfect peace.

When our attorney saw me at the door of his office he came out and said, "Mallory, it looks as if Heavenly Father had forsaken us."

I replied, "I do not feel that way, for I have just come home from a visit to my dear mother, in Canada, who has wonderful faith in God, and she told me God would straighten the matter all out." He shrugged his shoulders and in a hopeless tone of voice said, "I can't see it," and went back into his office.

I followed him in and waited until all the other clients had gone, and then we talked the matter over. Our lawyer was one of our directors. He had drawn up the by-laws when our corporation was formed. He had been present when the new directors were elected contrary to the by-laws. He had promised Dr. Cullis he would look up the title to the property when it had been purchased, but instead assumed it was all right upon the statements of another. He had been, therefore, directly responsible for the whole embarrassing situation which he felt most keenly; and what made it doubly sad was that he could see no way out without sacrificing the new building.

As we sat chatting we thought of something that had never before occurred to us—What was the form of the deed—quit claim or warranty? If the former, the onus of proof of validity lay on us; if the latter, it lay on the estate responsible for the deed. Here was at least a new opening for research. The gentleman from whom we made the purchase was at once notified. He immediately investigated the title of the property behind our purchase. The next day a party came with the old tax release, properly endorsed by the three necessary signatures, two of whom were dead. This release he had found among some old papers of his father's which were filed away in the back part of his safe.

We had it recorded that morning at the Registry of Deeds, and now one mountain of difficulty had all disappeared, the very next day after my arrival in Boston. How marvelous! Who could have foreseen this solution, but the Omnipotent One. Surely God answers prayer. If He begins, surely He will finish.

Our attorney was both astonished and pleased with this most unexpected turn of events, and was led to go around and see if the judge of the court of equity could help us out of our corporation tangle. He replied,

> Yes, I can tell you just what to do. Take your corporation book to the legislature and ask the clerk of the legislature committee to have an act passed authorizing the election of those directors and all the acts performed by them since their election ratified, and in the meantime I will appoint your treasurer a temporary receiver to negotiate this mortgage.

This he did, and our attorney took these two documents to the conveyancer, who said, as soon as he saw them, "I will notify the bank and you can have your money any time." So within forty-eight hours after my return to Boston the matter was all straightened out just as the Lord promised my dear mother.

Boston

For Your Scrap Book

Reverend A. Wallace Copper, A.B.

Lord Shaftsbury*

As a boy he hated his school. He said that nothing could have surpassed it for filth, bullying, neglect and hard treatment. His sensibilities, in later life, were quickened by the memories of his own childhood. When at the age of twelve he met a pauper's funeral, and the shock given to his senses by the coarse levity of the scene made him resolve to devote himself to the uplift of the poor.

His greatness was not evidenced as a cabinet minister or as a successful party leader, but as one of the guiding forces in the reconstruction of English life. He was a con-

*Lord Shaftsbury by J. L. Hammond and Barbara Hammond.

structive thinker and it was by sheer persistence he shamed his age out of its principles. The first factories that used water power, located in country places by a stream, depended on the labor of pauper children. They were slaves working fourteen hours a day and six days a week.

In 1815, when Sir Robert Peel proposed a bill forbidding the employment of children under ten years of age and limiting the working of children to ten hours a day, it was voted down immediately in the House of Commons. Men and women were old at twenty. Before the Sadler committee a worsted spinner, Joseph Hebergain, seventeen, described his day's work when he was seven years of age. His hours were from five in the morning to eight at night. Thirty minutes were free at noon but all other meals were taken in snatches. One man described how his little girl had worked six weeks from three in the morning until ten-thirty at night. When she sat at the table she fell asleep with the food in her mouth. Can you imagine the insight of a House of Commons that voted 238 to 93 that thirty thousand little girls were indispensable to the industrial life of England?

Shaftsbury discovered in lace mills little children who worked twenty hours a day. Their work was intermittent and in the intervals they would lie down on the floors. There were mills in which children never went home during the whole twenty-four hours. There were cases cited where in the coal mines little babies were taken down into the pits to keep the rats from their father's food.

When Shaftsbury delivered a two hour address in defense of little girls demanding they be excluded from the work in the coal mines, Sir George said, "I would rather have made that speech than any speech I have ever heard."

Children, seven, six, five, were employed as trappers in the mines, twelve hours a day. They worked in almost total darkness with virtually no companionship. Children were employed to pull carriages along an iron railing moving like dogs on all fours. They pumped water into coal pits twelve hours a day. This necessitated them standing in cold water ankle deep. They were granted a half an hour for lunch.

A man like Shaftsbury was in constant need of money. Richard Cobden had to borrow money and depend on the subscriptions of friends in order to fight the Corn laws. Pitt left debts to the extent of forty thousand pounds.

But in the midst of his own poverty Shaftsbury fought to defend the little children of three and four years of age who were taught to do minor things in the Calico Printing Works. In the factories of England the children worked from six-thirty in the morning until nine at night. It was noticed that each generation was more dwarfed and less robust than the preceding one. Shaftsbury did more than any single man or any single government in English history to check the raw power of the new industrial system. He was told in 1847 that if he were an ambitious man the opportunity for position was before him. He always looked upon himself as a man who relinquished his career for a cause.

He did not ask, like Peel, how a particular policy would effect commerce, or like Disraeli, how it would strike the imagination of England. He asked whether it was applying Christian standards to politics. Where Peel thought of the Board of Trade, and the earlier Disraeli of a romantic aristocracy, and the later Disraeli of the Empire or the crown, Shaftsbury looked to a Christian chivalry as his guiding principle.

No wonder that when he died, when his funeral procession was slowly marching down London's widest street, after he had fought the battle of defenseless little children, thousands of children marched after carrying garlands of roses which read,

I was hungry and ye gave me food, thirsty and ye gave me drink; naked and ye clothed me. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Faith's Spring Time

JOHN WARE

The year is old, the sun swings low,
The trees are bare, the cold winds blow,
My days are sad, and yet I know,
That over me, beneath, around,
His warmth and beauty so surround
His love, and mercy, so abound,
That whether skies be blue or gray;
December chill or blooming May,
The glory of His perfect day
Shines in my heart and I can see
Above the clouds that cover me
His love as one broad canopy.

Bridgeton, N. J.

THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D. I. M. HARGETT, D.D. ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D. FLOYD TOMKINS, D.D., LL.D. MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D. WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D. CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D. REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

The Whole Gospel

REVEREND GEORGE W. HANNERS

I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.—Acts 20:27.

GOD in his wisdom has called a class of men in the Old Testament known as prophets and in the New Testament known as preachers to do one thing—declare the divine will and purposes without fear or favor, without concealing or keeping back any part of the divine truth. Two obstacles have opposed the declaring of the whole counsel of God.

Most any one would prefer to be popular rather than unpopular, but to declare the truth has not always been popular, nor is it now. The Scribes and Pharisees hated Jesus because he uncovered their sin and told them the truth. Dr. Neighbour raises the question whether it is possible to preach the Gospel in America at the present time. In reply we would say it is possible to preach it if we are willing to pay the price. Dr. G. A. Kennedy well says,

> The parson must speak out whether the people like it or not and if they duck him: well, that is mild—they crucified Christ. The one thing the parson must insist upon is his right to give his people the message God gives to him on his knees and if he allows the fear of any form of persecution whether it be ducking or docking his salary to stand in the road of that, he must reckon with the God he serves and in whose name he speaks.

There is a threefold reason why a whole gospel should be preached:

1. *It will save the souls of men.* Man has invented many plans to save the soul, but God has provided just one. It has pleased God to save the world through the foolishness of preaching. The Gospel of the Son of God is the hope of men. Paul says, Romans 1:16, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Here is a remedy that meets the need of every soul who responds to God's conditions. The preaching of a complete Gospel brings repentance, new birth, assurance, a complete change both of heart and life. There is dynamite in the Gospel. Whenever Paul preached, a revival or a riot was the result.

Wesley used to ask his preachers two questions: (1) Have you had any one converted? (2) Have you made any one mad? If the answer was no, Wesley concluded that the preacher had no call. Today there are some people like the Scribes of Jesus' day. They think it is easier to get rid of the truth teller than to give up their sins.

It was thus the Pharisees decided to get rid of Jesus. But the truth teller is the friend of the soul. It is truth that makes men free. The physician does not prescribe for his patient a pleasing compound. Sometimes the medicine may be bitter; the point is, is it healing? The Gospel is healing no matter how unpalatable. A half gospel will save no soul, but the whole gospel will save every soul that will accept it.

2. *It will save the church.* God has committed a great privilege and responsibility to the Church. If the church declares the whole counsel of God, it will be a life saving station. On the contrary if it conceals or withholds the truth, it will become an ornate sepulchre to entomb the truth. When the church fails to proclaim the divine truth God removes it. When the old Jewish Church failed, degenerating into formalism and traditionalism, God displaced it and put in its place the Christian Church. When the churches of Asia Minor ceased to preach and live the whole gospel, God said he would remove their candlesticks out of their places. The continued existence of the present church depends upon its faithfulness in proclaiming God's word.

There was a time when the Methodist Episcopal Church had a passion for truth and soul saving. Since worldliness, modernism, unbelief and formalism crept into many of its pulpits, that passion has declined. Today with all of our wealth and membership

we seem largely to have lost our power. The disappearance of the class meeting, the prayer meeting, the dwindling congregations, the closing up or merging of many churches, the loss annually of thousands of members, the bringing home of our missionaries,—all these things tell the same sad story. The Holy Spirit is grieved. He cannot indite our message or inspire our hearts. If preachers will proclaim a full gospel the church will have power to triumph over all its enemies. It will be able to solve the problem of its young people. The question is frequently asked, "How can we keep our young people in the church?" Some one has well said, "Get them thoroughly born again through God's divine grace and they will have no desire for the shams of the world." It will solve the churches' financial problems. A lady once wrote to Horace Greeley stating that they had tried to run their church by giving oyster suppers, turkey dinners, ice cream socials, Tom Thumb weddings, neck tie socials, etc., and that they feared they would have to close the church doors, could Mr. Greeley suggest anything new, and the editor wrote back, "Try Christianity."

3. *It will save the world.* Statesmen and world leaders everywhere freely admit that the world is in a very critical condition, both morally, spiritually, and financially. No one seems to know the remedy; but, thank God, there is a remedy. It is the gospel of the Son of God. William Sunday has declared:

> The four curses of America are modernism, materialism, humanism and communism. They absorb everything but the truth and they deny everything but falsehood. They are tunneling under our faith, our houses, our churches, and our government, a keg of powder in one hand and a fuse and box of matches in the other. They are teaching our boys and girls in many schools and colleges that they have no minds—and no souls. That they are pieces of machinery, responding to the stimuli. In fact, they are teaching that there is no God, devil, heaven or hell; no, not even a right and wrong. Whatever you want you have a right to have. Individual opinion is the seat of authority. This is the peril of the world and the peril of America; and both America and the world can be saved from these four and all other curses of false philosophy by the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

President Hoover was correct when addressing a body of ministers in Atlanta:

> Governments have their normal limitations. They must depend largely upon churches and schools to preserve the spiritual and moral basis essential to the life of the States themselves. The governments know that the life of the world cannot be saved if the soul of the world is allowed to be lost.

England was saved from a bloody revolution by the preaching of the Wesleys and others. America was once saved from Atheism and decay by the preaching of Finney, Moody, and others, who shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God.

God is unchangeable and the gospel has the same power today as ever to save both men's souls and the church and the world, if it is preached fully and without fear. The greatest need right now is that every preacher should declare the whole counsel of God, calling men and women to believe, accept, love and live the truth, and to uphold those who are fearlessly declaring the truth.

May God help us to be true messengers of the glad tidings of salvation to every creature, to fear the face of no man, then at the end of the race we shall hear the welcome words, "Well done good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Camden, New Jersey

Union With Christ

E. W. Caswell, D.D.

For me to live is Christ.—Phil.1:21.

DWIGHT L. MOODY once refused to accept a gift of $30,000 so that he might retire from evangelistic work when he had passed his sixtieth birthday. To live preaching the Gospel was Christ to him; he loved such a life far more than rest from activity. The world needs many earnest, consecrated workers.

Paul, though in prisons oft and in persecutions everywhere, found that for him to live was not only the love, joy and peace of Christ shed abroad in his heart, but it brought to him the realization of Christ himself, his personality, his companionship. Paul suffered the loss of all earthly things, that he might win Christ, Who brings with him eternal riches for his children to enjoy.

What a glorious exchange Paul made! In Christ he is "poor, making many rich; having nothing, yet possessing all things; unknown, yet well known." No grander definition of true religion was ever written than this: "For me to live is Christ." It means, the Author of my life becomes the Saviour of my soul; the Sustainer of my being the Partner of my life. We are made heirs with him to the eternal inheritance. The infinite Friend who laid down his life to redeem us, takes up his abode in the hearts of his followers forever and ever.

Young People's Department

Reverend Harold John Ockenga, B.A.

Preface to Articles

For the thesis of this treatment of the Ten Commandments I am indebted to Dr. Cornelius Van Til, Professor of Apologetics in Westminster Theological Seminary. I have accepted his thesis because I believe it is Christian. However, it is not without having read some ten works on the Commandments by modern and past authors and consultation with classical commentaries that I present this series of studies in outline form.

For the full grip of the subject it is necessary to reread those articles on *The Schoolmaster to Christ, The Law Came by Moses,* and *Grace Came by Christ,* printed in previous issues. I trust that those societies using these lessons as their helps will grasp the meaning of the law as superimposed upon men, and from which men are constantly deflecting. This will lay the basis for your belief in sin and consequent work of grace.—*H. J. Ockenga.*

Topic for April 10

Substituting for God

Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Scripture.—Rom. 1:18ff, and Ex. 20:2.

Of the Ten Commandments, the first four were probably inscribed upon the first tablet of stone. These are the most important because they deal with man's relationship with God. They were summarized by Christ in the greatest of all commandments which is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all thy strength." When Jesus conversed with the Rich Young Ruler about a salvation by works, He omitted the first four Commandments. The reason for this is manifest. Religion is an experience of God, and it is with this that the first four Commandments deal. The salvation of works is not such a religion, and it was with works that the young man was concerned (Matt. 19). David's confession of sin manifests the importance of the relationship to God. Though he had sinned against society and individuals of that society, yet his prayer was, "Against thee and thee only have I sinned" (Ps. 51).

Only the truly religious man is the truly moral man, and this Commandment is the basis of morals. In it God brings man face to face with Himself. The rest of the Commandments tell man how to be truly religious and moral. But here the relationship of man's heart to God is all that matters. Two men may appear equally moral, but if one's morality is based upon his own intellect, he is not moral at all; the man who is moral because of his relationship to God has the true essence of morality.

There are three different divisions of the Ten Commandments, but an agreement as to the number—ten. The Greek Catholics and Reformed believers divide them as they are in the Book of Exodus. The Roman Catholic Church, followed by the Lutheran Church unify the first and second Commandments, and divide the tenth into two. This was done that they might enable themselves to use images representing Deity to their people. The Jews make the preamble the first Commandment, and include the first and second in one. However, the first and second Commandments are distinct—the first deals with irreligion and the second deals with idolatry. Whereas the tenth Commandment is one, for there is no distinction between types of covetousness. It is a condition and attitude of the heart. Polyatry and idolatry are quite different; the first allows the existence of other gods; the second produces a representation in a form of an idol of the true God.

1. The Commandment Was Not a Product of Man's Search for God

Almost every book which I have studied upon this subject opens with some statement similar to this: "Were this Commandment to be phrased today, it might read, 'Thou shalt have at least one God.'" They say that the Commandment does not tell the Jew that the gods worshipped by other nations have no existence but it tells them that he should offer them no homage. Does then the first Commandment simply enjoin upon us the worship of God, but not remove or deny the existence of other gods? If this is true that it does not, then surely the first Commandment is a very low stage in the Revelation of God. If the Jews were allowed to believe that Milcom the god of Ammon, and Chemosh the god of Moab, and Dagon the god of Philistia, and Baal the god of Sidon, were on a par with Yaweh the God of Israel, then surely that Commandment is far below our conception today. Even though this Commandment does not deal with other gods, it does demand that the Hebrew deal with the true God. Thus, if the law is a revelation of a theistic God, it cannot be a low step in the development of the human conception of God. We have had, lately, too much unscientific and loose talk about our changing conception of God. God does not change.

This law was not a development of man's mind but was superimposed upon Israel by God. The proof of this is that the people were constantly deflecting from the law. If it were an evolution of their experience it would have been natural for them to obey it. But instead, it was not until eight hundred years later, at the close of the exile period, and until the Jew had suffered affliction and chastisement, one upon another, that he was cured of his inclination toward idolatry. No nation so conceived in an idolatrous surrounding, such as Egypt, so nourished in an idolatrous location, such as Mesopotamia, and with such an inclination to-

ward the worship of idols could ever have evolved such a standard of laws, or such a command as the first Commandment. This Commandment was given by the Revelation of God.

It has often been argued that since there are so many parallel rites and laws in heathenism that all of them have sprung from primitive man to meet a common need. But this is not necessarily so. It is also a strong argument for the fact of an original revelation and a preservation of part of it among all nations due to the common grace of God given to all men. Without this common grace, heathenism would have deteriorated so far, that as Paul says, in the Book of Romans, God would have given them up for a complete self-destruction. It should also be remembered that law depends upon God, or it loses all of its authority. This is the great distinction between the law of modern philosophers and Christian law. Kant made law the universally legislative will of man. This substituted ethics for God, but in reality, it was simply the overflow of the law that was written upon the heart. Law is based on an absolute God, for its binding authority. This is the lack in Confucianism, Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism. It is also the lack in our modern ideas because in them the conception of law changes, and every man does what is right in his own eyes. The first Commandment is not the result of man's search for God, but is God's revelation of man.

2. The Violations of This Commandment

Who, then, is the man who breaks the first Commandment? He is one of three types: the philosophic violater, the practical violater, or the religious violater. Many of our young students of philosophy and science in the universities have given themselves over to theories that are deistic, pantheistic, animistic, and atheistic, but we have no space here to take up their theories. All are violations of this Commandment.

There are many practical violations of this Commandment. The god of business, instead of being the god of justice and honesty, is crudely put as money or wealth. The love of money is said to be the root of all evil. This is because it is made a god, and is a violation of the first Commandment, which is the source of all morality. The god of society, instead of being justice, is speedily becoming popularity in public opinion. Almost any standard is passed by in the love of popularity. The god of nations is force and nationalism, instead of brotherhood and love. The god of many nominal Christians, including the modernist, is what they call—a Christlike love, instead of Christ Himself as the representative of God. Substitutions for God have taken place all down the line of life in violation of the first Commandment.

Many are the religious violations. In ancient days, just surrounding Israel, were Baal, Milcom, Ashtaroth, and Dagon—substitutions for the true God. In modern days, in the Roman Catholic Church, which I honor and for which I have a great respect, there is a continuous violation of this Word of God in the use of images, honor of saints, and veneration of the Virgin Mary. When we perceive in our own churches the mad rush for new members, many of whom are not converted, we wonder if we, too, have not substituted for God.

3. The Emphasis for Our Generation

The sin of our generation is not the substitution of a heathen deity for God, but it is the complete disregard of God altogether. Not idolatry, but irreligion marks our day. But just as much as substitution for God is condemned, so a neglect of God is condemned. This Commandment demands a recognition of God, yet such a recognition is not rendered today. Our attitude is, "It makes no difference."

This command includes under it some essentials of the recognition of God. The first is the knowledge of God itself. Who is the "Yahweh" of the Old Testament? He is the God who appeared to Moses at the burning bush, and said, "I am that I am." He is the one who identified himself with this timeless being in the New Testament, even Jesus Christ who said, "Before Abraham was, I am." Thus we know that he is the "Law" God of Moses, and the love God of Christ. He is the creator of the universe, the deliverer of Israel, and the father of his people. The second essential in the recognition of God is faith. We must believe that God is what He says He is, that is, a Rewarder of those who diligently seek Him. The third is that we must openly confess Him before men, and this under all circumstances, and in spite of all oppositions, not only by avowal of the creed, but by appropriate acts of worship in public and in private. And finally, it also includes an exercise of all religious affections, which is appropriate to a personal relationship with the one true God, such as, love and fear, reverence and gratitude, submission and devotion. Now we see that the first Commandment is essentially religious and spiritual, demanding our love and service to the one True God.

Questions for Discussion

1. There is a theory that the worship of one God was a result of the evolutionary process. Man worshipped many gods first. How can you refute this?

2. Is the law as shown in the first Commandment a result of man's search for God? If not, why not?

3. Think of all the violations of the first Commandment. Why are they violations?

Topic for April 17

What Represents God to Us?
or, Idolatry

Scripture—1 Kings 12:25—16 chapt; Ex. 20:3.

WHEN Jeroboam became king of the ten tribes he made two calves of gold and set one in Bethel and the other in Dan, and said unto the Israelites, "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem: behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." And herein Jeroboam sinned, and made the people sin because he led them to worship before the two calves, and sacrificed unto them. Now Jeroboam did not tell the people that these calves were gods in themselves, but that they represented God, and would be an aid to their worship of God. They were really idols or images of the true God. And to them he built altars and burnt incense. Read

God's judgment of Jeroboam—1 Kings 14:9. Later on when God through the prophet condemned Ahab, it was because he walked in the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat. This man Jeroboam was guilty first of a violation of the second Commandment through the making of images, and second of the violation of the first Commandment in the worship of another god beside the Lord. It is impossible to break one of these two Commandments without breaking the other because they are inseparably connected.

1. The Essence of Idolatry

Idolatry consists in the worship of a representation of the true God, or of false gods. It is the treating of an image as one would treat the object itself. The easiest way to understand it would be to compare a photograph or a sculptured image with a person. It is the utilization of sensuous materials to help the mind and the spirit in its grasping of a subject.

At an early time idolatry had an entrance in the family of the chosen people. When Jacob and Rachel were returning from the land of Haran, Rachel stole her father's gods and hid them in her tent. When Jacob reached Canaan, he caused the people that were with him to bury all of their idols. Later the soldiers often carried idols to battle with them but these practices were simply manifestations of defections in a time and spiritual degeneration.

The prophet Isaiah sarcastically pictures the powerlessness of an idol. He says, "Who hath formed a god, or molten a graven image that is profitable for nothing." Then he depicts the workmen, heating the coals and cutting the tree, and then making an image of the same log which warmed him (read Isa. 44:15-17). Isaiah not only saw the helplessness of idols but he also realized the potency of the true God.

The Jews were never completely cured of idolatry until they returned from the captivity. Then they realized the extent of their sin against God. And in the time of Pilate, the whole nation was in a turmoil because he had placed the eagle, the symbol of Roman power above the gate of the temple. Even Pilate had to bow before their frenzied hatred of idolatry.

Sad to say, the sin of Jeroboam has become the sin of the so-called Christian Church. From the fourth century onward, images began to be used in the Church for the purpose of educating the masses who could neither read nor write. Gradually, they came to take another place, that is, a help to worship. And finally, they reached the state where Thomas Aquinas declared them to be true objects of worship as long as the veneration extended to them ended not in themselves, but only in the objects represented by them. This growth of the sin of Jeroboam in the Christian Church caused one of the greatest controversies ever experienced, and ended in the division between the Greek Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches.

Concerning the use of art, there is no division of opinion in its legitimacy as long as art is not used to stimulate worship. True art can only come through an appreciation of the beauty of the relationship of nature to God. And when that relationship becomes a sensuous help or hindrance to worship, it becomes idolatry. The reformers in Germany were extremely iconoclastic until restrained by the sudden appearance of Prince George who was Luther incognito. Iconoclasm also raged in Zurich during the victory of Zwingli, and in Geneva under Calvin. The Puritans of England also smashed images, broke cathedral windows, and generally compelled the Church to return to simplicity in worship. In as far as all of these had the conception of true worship and zeal for it, we honor them. But in as far as they confiscated and destroyed property not their own, we vehemently condemn them.

The reason an image violates the spirituality of the worship of God is because He Himself is a Spirit, and cannot be represented. Picture, if you can, a small rugged Jew, dark eyes, heavy lashed, unkempt hair, weatherbeaten brow, rounded of shoulders, and crude in demeanor. Then hear someone say, "That is Christ." You would say, "It cannot be." Nevertheless, you could not prove it, and neither could he. Again, picture a strong, robust, well-developed, handsome, clear eyed, smooth complexioned, soft skinned individual. No more do you know that that is a resemblance of Christ. We know about the Spirit of Christ, and the conduct and teachings and purpose of Christ, but the physical likeness is conspicuous by its absence. There is no reference, whatsoever, in the Gospels to it. Yes, Christ is the true representative of God, whom we should worship. But we do not know him "after the flesh." Philip, when desiring to see the father, was told, "He, that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Philip probably had looked upon the physical aspect of Christ and missed God. The writers of the Gospel missed the physical aspect because they saw God.

2. The Estimate of Idolatry

Several generations after the death of Jeroboam, the Scriptures characterize the life of wicked Ahab by saying that he walked in the sins of Jeroboam who caused Israel to sin. This is not a light thing to do in God's estimate of man. Any substitution for spirituality in worship and for God-regulated worship, which is mediated by Christ, is a violation of the true principles of worship. These violations lead one into the likeness of the object of worship. Now if that object of worship is lower than man himself, such as a deified passion, he will become ultimately the embodiment of the object that he worships.

That this is not a light thing is evident from the condition found by the apostle Paul. At Athens, the city abounded with idols, images and altars, even an altar to the unknown god. These people, through the worship of the gods of the pantheon, including their numerous deified passions, became like their gods. This is easily seen in reading the epistles to the Corinthians in which Paul tells us of the sins from which the people were saved. Though they constructed the great and beautiful Parthenon upon the Acropolis, still their lives kept sinking lower and lower until dominated by sin. This is the story of all idolatry.

In the Book of Revelation, we find that all idolaters shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone. This is a much condemned sin throughout the whole Scripture. The end of it is eternal destruction, and consignment to hell, whatever the hell represented by Christ's teachings is. And yet, there was an image of a serpent set up in the wilderness that when one looked upon it, it brought life to the soul.

And so there is an image of the invisible God who was made man about whom Christ said, "If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me."

3. The Effect of Idolatry

The influence of Jeroboam over succeeding generations was very great. The Scripture says of Ahab that he walked in the ways of Jeroboam. Ahab started his life of sin by worshipping the calves in Bethel and Dan, until his religious sense was so deadened that he did not see much difference between that and the worship of the idols of Baal, the Sidonian god. Hence, when Ahab had a two-fold incentive to take up the worship of Baal there wasn't much to restrain him. Politically, the Sidonians were more friendly with those nations who made room for their national god, and Ahab wanted to trade with these people. Then also he had fallen in love with a beautiful but unscrupulous Sidonian woman, Jezebel, who was a worshipper of Baal. In order to win both, he erected an altar at Samaria, in a temple that he dedicated to Baal. A sharp commentary is made upon the effect of this in Ahab's life in a short Scripture statement. It says, "And Ahab made a grove." Now a grove was a place dedicated to the revelries of the licentous worship of the god and goddess of fertility, Baal and Ashtaroth. The Scripture then says that he did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him. As soon as Jezebel took control of the household in Samaria she set about the destruction of the prophets of Jehovah, and soon the worship of the true God was practically passed, and Baal was the deity of the Israelites.

When things reached this state, the great prophet Elijah the Tishbite, came upon the scene. He became the saviour of the religion of Israel for through him they were led back to a spiritual worship of the true God. He utterly destroyed the prophets of Baal and wiped out their religion. There is no other way to avert the anger of a just God. We, too, must remove our idols and false practices into which the idols have led us.

Topic for April 24

Why Blaspheme God?
or, Impiety

Scripture—Ex. 20:4ff.

"WHAT'S in a name?" Shakespeare asks. The reply cannot help but be, "Much." A hasty glance over the names of history is sufficient to reveal much about the characters they represent. Now a name originally showed a relationship to God and to our fellowmen. A name expresses a meaning to someone else. If God did not exist, there would be no names, for there would be no relationship. A name is a revelation of being. The God of the Bible revealed Himself through the names by which He was called. The first name of God is El, which soon changed to Elohim. This means the Almighty One—the One who created the universe by His divine fiat. The next great name is Yahweh. This name was the name given to Moses by the burning bush, meaning the God who always was, who always is, and who always will be. It soon became combined with other names that it might mean—the Lord will provide, the Lord will deliver, and such like phrases. Daniel speaks of him as the Ancient of Days, and many are the minor names which are used of God. The final revelation of God came through Jesus Christ, who put a new meaning into the term God with His use of the word Father. Very rarely had God been thought of as a Father in the Old Testament. Jesus' prayer, "I have manifested Thy name unto the men Thou gavest me out of the world." He meant that He had revealed to man the kinship between God and man, and the wonderful love implied in the divine Fatherhood.

In a like manner, there are many names for Jesus Christ. One author has tabulated eighty of them. He is called—Adam, Advocate, Alpha and Omega, the Branch, the Captain, Emmanuel, and so on. Each one of these names reveals a distinct truth about the nature of Christ. Progressively, we come to know Him as we experience Him as a Rock, a Fortress, a Physician, a Saviour, or a Friend. His name reveals the meaning of His personality for us. Now God said, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord, thy God in vain, for He will not hold him guiltless who taketh His name in vain."

1. Vanity *vs.* Purpose (Take the name)

Jehovah was not a name given to God by the people, but it was given to the people by God. It may mean little to many but it means much to the people of God because they know Him and are known by Him. There is an implied command which is positive in this commandment. If we should not take the name of God in one way, how should we take it? We should have a knowledge of all that the name of God implies, the revelation of God. It means, then, that besides the stilted and partial knowledge of God and His revelation that remains in the human soul after the fall, there must also be some greater knowledge that is to be received. This is contained in the Word of God. The obligation of the Christian, then, is a private study of the Scripture that he may know God. The lack of a knowledge of the Bible on the part of most professing Christians today is one of the saddest things in the Church for it makes the people of God prey to all the isms that flaunt themselves across our land. It is incumbent upon the Christian to found schools in which to propagate Christian truth. We talk loosely about neutral institutions. There is no such a thing as a neutral school. You either accept God's Revelation and do everything in life from that standpoint, or else you reject it and do everything from that standpoint. To assume that facts are unrelated in the universe is to assume that God has no control over them. The Roman Catholics have recognized that neutrality is a false view and consequenlty educate their children. Yet for a Protestant Church to even get trained Sunday School teachers, or to have the parents send their children to Sunday School, seems almost an impossibility. It's time to open our eyes on this subject.

It is incumbent upon the Christian to both support and to carry on Christian missions that he might make the name of God known. That means to make it known in this country, among the slums and foreigners, and everywhere in the world. He should make the name known in all social relationships of life. God, being the moral

governor in this world, should be known in it. In such a way the effort of those laboring at present for a national Christian newspaper ought to be supported. There could be nothing of greater value for the morality of our nation than this.

To take the name of God means also a personal acceptance of that name, and a confession of it, both privately and in public confessions of the Church. The talk about the Church without creeds is foolishness for we can never know Christ and God unless we know something about them. A subscription to even the names of God and Christ as they are revealed in the Bible is the beginning of a creed. It is true that we may receive a greater light today upon truth than was received in days gone by, and yet, at the same time, it will only be an enlargement of that Truth rather than a changing from it.

When the name of God is taken it must not be taken in vain, for vanity. Now this includes many things. First, is the use of magic. It was but a step from the use of the name Jehovah or rather the refusal of its use to a superstitious employment of the name of God as if, by that name alone, magical results would transpire. The use of the name of God for a lie is equal to blasphemy.

Careless, idle words, so often indulged in by our moderns, should be thought of in the light of the judgment. Light, dealing with eternal facts and verity, ought to be sufficient to condemn one. Closely akin to this is the constant jesting and also the songs one so frequently hears about Scriptural texts. Many texts, which contain words of eternal value, have been spoiled for us by the connection of them with some crude joke. There is nothing easier than to provoke laughter by the incongruous association of the most serious things in life with the most ludicrous, and yet there is nothing more dangerous.

A most important matter with which this commandment deals is legalized oaths. Some people have contended that it is not right to ever take an oath; such an attitude is entirely unscriptural. Just as the Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids only unlawful killing, so this Commandment forbids only unlawful oaths. An oath before a magistrate is based upon the great truth that the sovereign ruler of the universe who is represented by the magistrates in the divine institution of government is present to hear and to witness of the truth of a matter. God Himself made an oath to Abraham.

2. Profanity vs. Reverence

Regardless of what was the habit of gentlemen several generations ago when it seemed that swearing was a mark of culture, it is decidedly taboo today, and it is a violation of the commandment of God. Swearing reveals certain things about an individual who uses profanity. First, it is distinctly ungentlemanly, and is a sin against society. An individual who is in the habit of often visiting Taylor University testified that in all of his contacts with the students, both in the dormitory and on the athletic field, he had never heard one swear word. I am proud of that. One can always find profanity in libertine society and in low class clubs, but generally, men and women of culture do not practice it. Then also profanity is utterly inexcusable. It is a wicked thing indulged in by careless or degenerate spirits. It is also a mark of ignorance or of a very limited vocabulary. When experiencing an emotion such as anger which is difficult to express, the ignorant man will swear.

There are certain reasons advanced for swearing. Freud would say that an expression of a feeling was better than a suppression, but that is not true, and Freud's psychology is passing out of favor today. It serves the purpose of making an impression. This is the case with those whose speech is not sufficient to carry weight. Another explanation is the desire to self-assertion. Those who wish to reveal the aspect of independence of God and of parents, often use profanity. That was the case of Peter when he cursed during his denial. He wanted to impress them with his independence from Christ. Those who wish to reveal their independence from God ought to remember that the chances are ten to one that they shall never be accused of being pious even though they do not curse.

The punishment for profanity acts immediately. It begins to rob one of his finer nature and of his appreciation of the beautiful things of life. The rejection of God's claims in this field makes it easier to reject His claims in other fields. We become unready to acknowledge Him in His sovereign personality. And ultimately if this sin is not repented of the individual will be banished from the presence of God.

The sense of awe should rest upon us today when we deal with the name of God. That emotion which caused the Jews to never mention the name Jehovah, should restrain us from a careless, deceitful, profane use of His name today. God is everywhere, and He sees and hears all. We should not be guilty of making Him a witness to either falsehood or to vain talk and vain life The Christian life is completely bound up in the name of the Lord, and when the Christian hears His Lord insulted, it takes the pleasure out of many otherwise innocent and enjoyable practices in life. That which affects his God also affects his life. God will "not hold him guiltless who taketh His name in vain."

Topic for May 1

The Ethical Controversy about Sunday

Exodus 20:8.

THE following is not an exposition of this Commandment. It is not a parallel study to the other nine Commandments which are appearing in this section. It is an interlude in a continuous study. It is not to be doctrinal, but ethical. Personally, it is impossible for me to have an ethical teaching without a doctrine. Therefore, the study of this Commandment will simply be suggestive and will not present my personal teaching. It is not because the author does not know what he believes upon this subject that this article is written in the following manner, but simply because the magazine does not have space enough to give to both sides of the Sabbath controversy.

1. A Suggested Unbending

Recently a prominent business man of Pittsburgh said to me, "You preachers must unbend upon this Sabbath question. If you do not, you will find it taken out of your hands altogether."

If it is a mere matter of unbending it is far better that our ministers should not unbend. But if it is a matter of restating an eternal truth then it is very important that our ministers reconsider the Sabbath.

That the situation in the world has changed within the last fifty years there can be no doubt. That man has lived a different kind of life in the past than he lives today is also evident. The question arises as to whether the old Sabbath is sufficient to meet the new need. Formerly, there were no cities the size of our present day cities, causing people to live in tenement districts, and walled canyons called apartments. In those days people were nearer the soil. They received exercise in their weekly work. They enjoyed the out-of-doors. Not so today. Now they rise in the dark of the smoke covered city. They ride in a subway, and are cooped up in an office six days out of seven. They do not have time to get out in God's great out-of-doors. Are they then wrong in their action on the one day that is dedicated to God if they spend it with nature, or with golf, or with some other outdoor exercise? This is the problem. This problem is amplified in the question of amusements. Should these people be allowed to have entertainments such as Sunday baseball, theaters, and other diverting activities?

There are two reactions to this problem; one is that of what is known as the Blue Sunday, or closed Sunday. This is still practiced in Pennsylvania and is still the law of New Jersey, although it is not enforced in that state. The other attitude is that of the state of Illinois or of New York, which allow an open Sunday with the practice of anything that could be carried on during the week. Which of the two has the correct attitude in America? Should the Christian align himself with the forces for an open Sabbath, or should he attempt to force the states into legal support of the closed Sabbath? It is well to remember that the Christian Church never teaches force in anything. If, through education, it can illumine sufficient people to bring about an attitude that will support public reform then it has accomplished its duty as far as public morality is concerned. The Church itself has no right to identify itself too closely with reform. It must preach a Gospel of transformation of individuals, and through the awakened Christian conscience allow the individuals to vote for civic transformation. The Church is out of its place when it identifies its message solely with political reforming issues.

The author has observed the work of the Church in both types of states, and must conclude that the Church work is no more powerful and influential in the states with the closed Sabbath, than in those with the open. The churches that preach an uncomprising gospel make a great indentation upon either type. It is our duty to keep high standards of ourselves and to preach high standards for Christians, but if the Christians are in minority they cannot force the majority to take their position.

2. A Consistent Observance

To be consistent in this matter depends upon one's view of the Scripture teaching about the Sabbath. First, if one believes as do the Seventh Day Adventists that the Old Testament Sabbath still holds for the church age Christian, then logically, he must obey to the letter all of the teachings about the Old Testament Sabbath. For those interested it is a simple matter to find this teaching by a study of all the passages relating to the Sabbath which are listed in the concordance.

Secondly, if one believes that the Old Testament Sabbath was changed to the New Testament Lord's Day, his observance will be entirely different if he is logical. Such an individual should remember that the early Christians observed the Old Testament Sabbath for rest from work, but the New Testament Lord's Day for worship is remembrance of the resurrection of Christ and the coming of the Holy Spirit. Hence, all of the Old Testament teaching of the Sabbath was not immediately transferred to the New Testament Lord's Day. This resulted through the process of change through three centuries. Work was performed upon the first day, and worship was observed in the early morning or the evening. It was not until the days of Constantine that it became a workless day. Hence, there is some support for the contention that the New Testament Sabbath is a creation of the clergy out of self-protection. The logical New Testament Christian must admit that it is perfectly legitimate to work, and if to work, then to play, upon the Lord's Day.

Thirdly, regardless of which of these interpretations one takes, it is his obligation to fulfill the creation Sabbath, that is, the proportion of one day in seven for rest. Whether he does that on the last day of the week as looking back to the creation in rest from his work, or the first day of the week in looking forward to the new creation in worship that strengthens him for work, yet the proportion is the same and there must be one day's rest in seven. If this spiritual law is broken the evil effects will be reaped, biologically, psychologically, and socially.

Without committing ourselves then as to the doctrines commonly taught in the Christian church concerning the reason for the change of the Old Testament Sabbath to the New Testament Lord's Day we demand from both parties the logical fulfillment of their own premises.

3. A Provocative Study

First, it is our suggestion that the individual interested in this question consider the true meaning of the Gospel, and from that meaning deduce the course of action to be applied in the case of the Sabbath. Is Christianity a matter of the heart, or the matter of law? Then study the dispensations of the Bible, the question of the abrogation of the law and the problem of what is the law for the Christian life.

Second, we advise the student to learn all that is possible about the Lord's Day Alliance, to receive its pamphlets and teachings through tracts that he may decide his course of action on this question.

Third, the one and only source of teaching for the Christian is the Bible. Let the earnest Christian study all of its references to the Sabbath, to the Lord's Day, and to the record of the practices of the Early Church as recorded in the Book of Acts and in the epistles of Paul.

The author does not feel that this is a satisfactory presentation of the subject of the Sabbath, but due to limitations placed upon him, submits this to you with the qualification that it does not express its own view.

The Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A.,D.D.

Has Science Discovered God?

THE title of this article is also the title of a book recently issued: *Has Science Discovered God?* It is published by Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 393 Fourth Ave., New York, and is edited and compiled by Rev. Edward H. Cotton, of Marblehead, Mass. It contains articles by sixteen well-known scientists. Nine of the essays were written especially for this book, while the remaining seven chapters were selected by the compiler, and are used by the permission of the various publishers. In the course of our review we shall mention the most eminent scientists who have a part in this symposium. The picture of each contributor appears in connection with his essay.

One of our major reactions in reading this book is this: If there is a God, would it not be marvellously strange if He had never made Himself known to the human family, or had never been discovered by them, until this twentieth century of the Christian era, millenniums on millenniums, after He had brought the human race into existence? If this is a fact, we are wondering whether people will have much love and respect for a God who has thus kept Himself hidden from His struggling children.

Another thought has come from reading this book: It is still not certain that, with all their labored efforts, these scientists, all of them entirely in earnest, have really discovered God; or if they have, He is a very nebulous kind of a Being, bearing very little resemblance to the personal, all-wise, all-powerful and holy God revealed in the Bible as the Creator, Preserver and Redeemer of the world. One must make an exception of Michael Pupin, who seems to accept the God revealed by our Lord. Others have more to say about Cosmic Reality than about a personal God who takes an intelligent and affectionate interest in the human family.

But what a blind term is "Cosmic Reality" when applied to God. Why, "Cosmic Reality" is simply the universe itself. Surely the physical scientists believe that the material universe is real, not phantasmagorial. So, unless one is an out-and-out pantheist, one cannot identify God with "Cosmic Reality."

The favorable impression we have received from reading this book is this: that so many leading scientists of our day have come to the conclusion that there must be *Mind* back of and in the universe in order to explain it adequately. The book is really a broadside against the atheism and materialism of the day. No wonder, therefore, that Bertrand Russell, H. L. Mencken and Maynard Shipley (also the Four A's) are poking fun at these scientists, intimating they have deserted the field of hard-headed science and are moved by a species of soft-headed sentimentality.

The editor of the book, Mr. Cotton, is a slippery person. He oscillates to and fro, like a person who has not yet come to a solid conclusion. Now he extols religion; now he blames it for almost everything bad. He has a special dislike for "established," "orthodox" and "traditional" religion. He is a thoroughgoing Modernist. He says he does not want to use "invectives," but he certainly does use innuendo. Some quotations will indicate his attitude and temper.

> Jesus was a spiritual genius, best exemplar of an eternal, merciful Reality. If there is any proof of God in religion, it is in Jesus and in other heroic souls who have lived in imitation of Him. It is certainly not in theologies, creeds and spectacular declarations, as an infallible Bible, a decree-in-council, or a pronouncement ex-cathedra.

What a jumble of things he throws together in the last sentence, just as if all the items were of the same despicable character. Further on he declares that "the method of the scientist is not to announce the fact until it has been proved." In view of all the speculations of the scientists, we cannot help calling that a wild statement. We believe that we are still awaiting *proof* of the theory of man's evolution from an animal pedigree. The anthropoid apes are making no advance-

ment toward the human status today, even with all the chance they have to do so. Not one of them can even learn the alphabet or manage to spell "ape" or "ass."

"If God is found, research will find Him, not traditional religion," says our dogmatist. We reply: Thousands upon thousands of sincere and self-sacrificing people who hold to traditional religion have found God, through all the centuries, by a true Christian experience. Has not Mr. Cotton himself yet found God through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ? What do Christian people think of a statement like this?

> But we are inclined to think that the sooner religion in the traditional and orthodox sense surrenders the quest for Cosmic Reality, and concentrates on serving men in their personal needs, the better for religion and the better for humanity. Religion has been given a considerable chance. But has it found any but a nebulous, uncertain, unsatisfactory God? Religion has measured deity with the rods of dogma, pronouncements of councils, sectarian confessions, which, in turn, have been determined by political expediency, tradition, and a knowledge limited to locality and time.

Is that a judicial way of dealing with the great Christian fathers who formulated the Nicene Creed, the Chalcedonian Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the Augsburg Confession, the Westminster Confession? We hold that Mr. Cotton's asseverations indicate the hectic temper rather than the calm and judicial mind. Does Mr. Cotton have the necessary information to write on his self-chosen subject? For example, he says: "Present day research sees design in the universe. This is one of the most significant contributions." Is the writer not aware that Paley used the design argument long ago, and that it has been used in works on theism ever since? Has he never heard of the time-honored teleological argument for the divine existence?

Our author's psychology is also defective. He says that "the criminal was simply unfortunate in his heredity and environment. He could not have acted otherwise." He credits this doctrine to "relativity," but he puts it in such a way as to give it his own endorsement. He says, "Investigate environment first, and punish afterward." Meanwhile what shall be done with the criminal? And if it is found that his environment was wholly to blame for his crime, what shall then be done with him? Thus, you see, Mr. Cotton's views are impractical. Our feeling is that he has done his book injury, and has put some of the scientists in the wrong company, by his liberalistic, unfair and ex-parte Introduction, covering 27 pages. He would have done better just to let them speak for themselves.

Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, of Harvard University, makes the first contribution to this volume. In closing his essay, he seems to convey the impression that "the teachings and life of Jesus" represent the finest qualities of universal energy and set the highest standard of life for the race. Yet he leaves the whole matter with a question-mark and a tentative experiment, saying: "Is the truly Christian way of life the finest and the best? There is only one method of answering the question, the scientific method—try it and see." But does Dr. Mather mean to answer *yes* or *no* to his question? That is the riddle. Has not science enough data in this twentieth century to answer that question one way or the other?

But Dr. Mather spoils things pretty badly before he reaches his dubious *finale*. He avers (yes, scientists sometimes do aver) that "the tattered and frayed pages of Mother Earth's diary cover a period of well on toward two billion years." If those pages are so "tattered and frayed," it surely must be difficult to fix their chronology. The only religion, Dr. Mather says, that will survive is that which is in harmony with "the current scientific description of man and the universe." Of course, that "description" is the evolutionary one. The emergence of personality seems to Dr. Mather to imply something like personality to produce it. "It is to these particular portions of the cosmic energy that I would apply the term God," he says. "For me, God is the motive power which tends to produce a fine personality in a human being."

Well, if to identify God with "particular portions of cosmic energy" and with "motive power" is the best that science can do, so much the worse for science. It is more like pantheism than theism. It has little likeness to the Heavenly Father whom Jesus Christ revealed to the world.

Professor R. A. Millikan's kindly face and penetrating eyes greet us as the next essayist in this symposium. We wish we could take the time to characterize his effort as it deserves. He is a Unitarian, and hence does not hold the orthodox view of Christianity. But he says many good things about Christianity and the church. He believes that

ninety-five per cent of the altruistic and humanitarian work of the world is to be credited, directly or indirectly, to the influence of organized religion.

Dr. Millikan thinks that science is much less boastful than it once was; it has become more humble. Here is a good rub: "There have been many religious dogmatists; but not a few of them, alas, among scientists." Science has added nothing to our knowledge of what ultimately becomes of the individual, and so religion must deal with that question. He quotes some of the sayings of Jesus, and evidently gives them his approval.

However, Dr. Millikan is obsessed with the theory of evolution, and would probably call it the divine *modus operandi*. Strangely, he thinks that evolution has given us the highest conception of God. No other, he says, has been half so productive of effort on the part of man to change bad conditions.

That statement needs to be challenged. How much has evolution done to change the conditions of the East End of London or the slums of our American cities? On the other hand, orthodox Christians have rescued many an outcast from sin and changed many a neighborhood's social, material and moral conditions.

> Modern science of the real sort is learning to walk humbly with its God. And in learning that lesson it is *contributing* something to religion. (Italics ours).

Why, Dr. Millikan, the prophet Micah, whom you quote, taught that principle some 700 years before Christ—that is, over 2,600 years ago. Science is a pretty late comer if it has just found out that great truth. Still, we are grateful that science has at last caught up with the Bible, and has confirmed the age-old doctrine of Holy writ.

"Science Reverent Before Cosmic Wonder" is the title of the next essay, which is by Sir Arthur S. Eddington, whose works are so well known in this country. He is an earnest Quaker, and therefore more or less of a mystic.

We cannot pause to go into details, but if we understand our philosopher's position, it is practically this: physical science cannot by itself find out God or discover spiritual reality, because it deals with material things, which appeal only to man's senses; but there are mystical experiences in religion which are just as real as are the impingements of physical sensations upon man's consciousness, and the physicist has no right to deny the reality of these mystical experiences. Such subjective experiences come from God. Therefore a spiritual experience proves to him who has received it what science cannot prove with all its laboratory processes.

Professor Edwin G. Conklin, of Princeton University, comes next in the procession with an article entitled "A Biologist's Religion." He has a kind of religion, but it is not the divinely revealed religion of the Bible; it is one that is fixed up to suit himself. He holds that "there is, and can be, no conflict between science and religion, for they deal with different universes." Yet inconsistently his religion is made to conform to his scientific view, which is that of evolution.

It is sad, and amusing at the same time, to note how many scientists fall into error when they attempt to deal with problems of theology. Dr. Conklin says that "many Christians believe that biology is the Judas among the sciences." We know many Christians, both learned and unlearned, but do not know one who holds that absurd view. Many scientists are gifted with an over-fertile imagination. Dr. Conklin thinks—at least, he intimates—that the Bible teaches the geocentric view of the universe. We have shown again and again that this is not true. Wherever he can, he casts reflections on the Bible. When he does so, he caricatures. Note this:

> No longer is it possible to think that man was created perfect in body, mind or morals, or that in physical form he is the image of God. No longer is it possible to think of God as "the Good Man" or of the Devil as "the Bad Man." No longer is it possible to regard miracles—in the sense of suspension or violation of natural law—as of daily occurrence, nor magic as the universal means of controlling nature or supernatural powers. To persons of mature mind this faith of childhood is gone and gone forever.

To us it is amazing to note how the modernists and evolutionists misunderstand and caricature—whether wittingly or unwittingly, we will not say—the evangelical doctrines and the plain teaching of the Bible. For instance, who holds that man's "physical form" is in the divine image? No one. Nor does the Bible teach it, for God forbade the making of any image or picture of Himself, because He is a spiritual Being. Neither do evangelical scholars hold that miracles are a "violation of natural law," nor do they believe in "magic," which is expressly forbidden in the Bible. Nor have they ever taught that miracles are "of daily occurrence." As for the

terms, "the Good Man" and "the Bad Man," most people of ordinary intelligence know that they are merely figures of speech. Why do some people waste so much time thrashing over a man of straw?

However, we are glad to say that Dr. Conklin joins the ranks of the theists, and thus delivers some good blows against the mechanists and atheists of our day. Here is something worth quoting:

> The theist sees, back of the whole process, divine power and plan. The Christian sees a Heavenly Father. Science cannot deal with this mystery; it is a matter of faith alone; but it is plain that Christian faith gives the largest value to human life and the greatest stimulus and comfort. . . . Science cannot solve the great mysteries of our existence—why we are, whither we are bound, what it all means. Faith alone assures us that there is definite purpose in all experience. This knowledge makes life worth living and service a great privilege.

This is very good. We would simply add that Christian faith, which is not blind faith, does give inner assurance of truth, pardon and salvation; also that sound reason is on the side of such faith and experience.

The chapter by Albert Einstein, entitled "The Meeting Place of Science and Religion," is reprinted from an article in the *Forum*. He fails to find a personal God, such as the Bible portrays, but rather discredits the Biblical conception. He also denies the freedom of the will. He is a decided determinist in psychology. All the far he gets in his quest for God is to find what he calls "the cosmic religious sense." But that seems to us a good deal of an *ignis fatuus*.

As for Julian Huxley, he has a religion all his own. He rejects the chief doctrines of the Christian religion, and does not believe in a personal, transcendent and immanent God at all. Yet he claims to be religious, although just what his religion is, it would be hard to say. Perhaps it is a kind of reverent wonder in the presence of the vast and mysterious universe.

However, the historical meaning of the term "religion" is, a recognition of the supernatural. But Mr. Huxley cannot tolerate anything of a supernatural character. Has a man a right to change the lexical and historical meaning of a word just to suit his peculiar individual fancy? Julian Huxley's kind of evolutionary science fails in its quest for God.

Much to our regret, we must abbreviate. Professor George F. W. Patrick, the philosopher, is evidently a monist in psychology. He does not believe in any "mind stuff" or in "a metaphysical mind." What he means by the term *mind* or *soul* is simply "these processes"—that is, the processes of sensation, feeling, reason, etc. How much clearer is the doctrine that there is a mind as a real psychical entity which carries on those mental processes! It is hard to see how *nothing* could carry on any kind of procesess. After reading Dr. Patrick's contribution, we were obliged to write on the blank part of his last page: "This chapter is the despair of the person who is seeking clarity and definiteness."

Dr. William McDougall, the eminent psychologist, speaks of the mind as an "entity," and we believe he is right. From that premise clear reasoning will lead to God as the eternal creative Mind, or, as the Bible puts it, Spirit.

Professor J. Arthur Thomson seems to believe in God, and in a kind of creation of the primordial material, with inherent potentialities for development; but, he adds, "without subsequently interpolated direction;" which is his way of bowing out providence and miracles. God must not intervene, once He has started up the evolutionary process. There is little difference, in fact, no essential difference, between that view and the English Deism of several centuries ago. It says to God, "Hands off!"

Perhaps the clearest chapters in this symposium, those that come the nearest to the Christian conception of God, are the essays by Michael Pupin and Sir Oliver Lodge, both of whom seem to teach that physical science cannot discover God, but that He must and can be known in a spiritual way and a spiritual experience. Pupin is led to believe that physics, chemistry and biology will not explain everything even in the material realm, and therefore he is led to believe that there must be a transcendent spiritual reality to explain the universe adequately, as well as to complement the religious needs and experiences of mankind. Sir Oliver teaches his belief in a spiritual realm through his psychic investigations with spiritualistic mediums.

After reading all these erudite essays by leading scientists, we are more than ever convinced that mere physical science cannot discover a God who is much worth while,

but that the true God has graciously revealed Himself in the Bible. It is there that He has clearly made Himself known as the Creator, Preserver and Redeemer. This doctrine is verified to the believer in a Christian experience. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" Our answer is No! But God has manifested Himself through His Word and His only-begotten Son.—*L. S. K.*

Reviews of Recent Books

The Acts of the Apostles. By W. Graham Scroggie, D.D. Harper & Bros., 49 East 33rd Street, New York City; 35 Great Russell Street, London, England. $1.25.

Dr. Scroggie is always helpful, spiritual and suggestive in his expositions of the Bible. He has immersed himself in Holy Writ, and thus finds in it many treasures that others do not discover without his aid. Here is a rare book on the Acts of the Apostles. Dr. Scroggie's Introduction is of real value. He tells about the title, the authorship, the date, the unity, the sources, the chronology and the purpose of the book of Acts. He upholds its Lukan authorship by cogent argument and appeal to facts. On the unity of the book he has these good words to say:

> The idea of a number of redactors or editors working over a number of sources can scarcely be taken seriously. The impression left upon one from reading the book is that it is a story coherent and progressive, and a detailed study of it confirms this impression.

This he says over against the theory of the divisive critics who want to make out that the book of Acts is a work of bric-a-brac, just as they do the Pentateuch, Isaiah and other books of the Bible. In Dr. Scroggie's vital and well classified exposition of the book of Acts the various characters live again and seem like real persons. As one reads, one feels the spiritual power of the inspired Word pulsing more and more strongly in his soul, and realizes that these words are spirit and life.

The Psalter: Volume I. By W. Graham Scroggie, D.D. Harper & Bros., New York and London. $1.25.

Here is a book of real educational, as well as spiritual, value. It gives much information regarding the Psalms. There are enlightening sections on Hebrew poetry, the division of the Psalter, authorship and age of the Psalms, the many titles and terms used in connection with the Psalms, the character of the Psalter, the prophetic element, the theological and the devotional elements of the Psalms, a reading scheme and a selected bibliography. Then come expositions of the Psalms from the first to the forty-first. The author gives original titles to his treatment of the various Psalms. Here are a few just as samples of the good things in the book: "Two Portraits" (the first Psalm); "Before Going to Bed" (Psalm four); "Talk and Walk" (Ps. five); "The Perils of the Pilgrim" (Ps. ten); "From Sighing to Singing" (Ps. thirteen).

"Charge That to My Account" and Other Gospel Messages. By H. I. Ironside. Litt.D. Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago. Paper bound, 25 cents; cloth, 75 cents.

In reading these inspiring messages one cannot help saying to oneself, "How wonderfully the Bible lends itself to suggestive discourse!" Almost any passage from its holy pages can be used as a text for a useful sermon. So here Dr. Ironside just takes that little saying of Paul in his Titus Epistle, "Put that on mine account," and makes a most impressive sermon out of it. Whether Dr. Ironside speaks or writes, he is always interesting and impressive. God used these messages when they were delivered from pulpit and platform for the salvation of souls, and so they are here published to give them still wider audience and influence. Did you know that there was such a verse as this in the Bible; or, if once you read it, did you not forget all about it? "The labor of the foolish wearieth every one of them because he knoweth not how to go to the city" (Eccles.10:15). Well, this forms the basis of a suggestive sermon by Dr. Ironside on "The Way to the City." The way to find out about that *way* is to get this book and read the message. But here are some more titles that stir a desire to read what the author says about them: "Dreams that will never Come True;" "The Sinless One made Sin," "The Greatest Text in the Bible;" "Inside the Veil and Outside the Camp."

Bethel Heart Throbs of Revival. (No author named). Bethel Mission, Box 533, Shanghai, China.

We regret that no author is named on the title-page of this engagingly written booklet, and no price indicated. It gives a most refreshing account of the successful evangelistic work of the Bethel Mission during the last year. It was indeed a year of grace. And it was the "old-fashioned Gospel" that did it. No new gospel and no new-fangled methods. God simply touched and melted "surrendered hearts and lives." You will want to read the story of Pastor Andrew Gih's conversion and the wonderful evangelistic enterprise which he and his three comrades undertook and carried out. The successful work of many others is described in a graphic way; also the many conversions that took place right in the mission itself. This is the mission with which Drs. Mary and Phebe Stone were connected. We sav "were," because Mary, so well known as "Mother Stone," was translated to the better land on April 25, 1931. But she, being dead, yet speaketh. A number of pictures, made from photographs, add interest to this narrative.

God's Prophets Versus Soothsayers Like the Philistines. By C. H. Cooke. The H. L. Bryan Co., Columbia, S. C. Paper; no price given.

We wish that we could spare the time to go into the details brought out in this book, so that a real authoritative analysis of it might be set forth. But that is impossible. The purpose of the booklet is to indicate the difference between the true prophecies of God's Word over against false prophecies and wrong interpretations of the predictions of Holy Scripture. One thing we note: the author does not believe that any specific dates can be determined from the figuring that has been done in and about the Great Pyramid. The author has probed deep into the prophetic teaching of the Bible, and we believe that all people who have specialized along the line of prediction will find this a very interesting discussion.

A Trinity of Christian Graces. By George Henderson. G. F. Vallance, Pub., 2 Broomhill Road, Goodmayes, Essex, England. 9 pence.

The small size and price of this brochure is by no means the measure of its worth. The Christian reader may easily judge what the "Trinity of Graces" are. The book is a series of chapters on Faith, Hope and Love. The author treats them in a most vital and evangelical way. Faith in Christ gives the foundation; hope looks forward to the glorious end of a life of faith; love brightens, blesses and motivates the whole course of the Christian's career. Paul is the apostle of faith, Peter the apostle of hope, John the apostle of love. The following poem is so revelant and beautiful that we quote it:

Faith takes from God salvation's cup,
Hope waits the joys unseen,
With holy service love fills up
The little while between.

Love gives to faith its mighty power,
To hope its joyous ray;
Love brightly cheers the darkest hour,
And smoothes the roughest way.

And when the fight of faith is o'er,
And hope fulfilled shall be,
Love then shall reign from shore to shore
To all eternity.

Our author does not endorse the false saying, "No matter what you believe, just so you live right." He shows the practical illogic of such an adage. He rejects Alexander Pope's couplet:

For modes of faith let graceless bigots fight;
He can't be wrong whose life is in the right.

Another poet has corrected Pope, and has put the matter in a better way:

In Christian faith let Christian men be strong;
He can't be right whose faith in in the wrong.

God's Intention. By W. Y. Fullerton, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York City. $1.25.

It affords much comfort and solid satisfaction to believe in God, and to believe that He has a purpose in the creation and ongoing of the cosmos. How much better is such a confidence than to take the position of the agnostic, who thinks that the world came into existence somehow or other, nobody knows how and nobody knows why! Following the teaching of the Bible, and taking its teaching for granted as true, Dr. Fullerton traces the purpose of God through Biblical history from the beginning to the consummation of all things. Everywhere he finds purposefulness. In every providential movement and every movement of grace it is plain that God had an intention. He has never worked at haphazard. Best of all, being all-wise, all-powerful and true and just, His purpose has been the very best. When He decided from eternity to create the universe and the race of mankind, He knew what He was doing and had His ultimate purpose in mind. That is the reason the universe sub-

sists; that is what gives it unity and coherence; that is the reason it does not hurl itself into universal chaos. Dr. Fullerton's book is a very helpful one, convincing to the intellect and satisfying to the emotions. It is entirely evangelical.

You Must Go Right On. By A. Z. Conrad, Ph.D.,D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York City. $1.25.

The last word which a dying saint said to Dr. Conrad was, "You must go right on," meaning that he must go right on with the work he was doing for kingdom-advancement. That saying gave him the title for this book. It is needless to praise Dr. Conrad. It can always be taken for granted that he says and writes something that is more than merely worth-while; something uplifting, bracing to one's faith, something that propels one to action. He is the master of the short sentence; he loves to make epigrams that stick in the mind; he is fond of alliterations. But, of course, these attractive literary qualities are not the main thing. The main thing is, he is devotedly, earnestly, convincingly evangelical, always loyal to Christ and the Divine Word. By giving some of the striking titles of his chapters the reader will surely feel that he will want to get a copy of Dr. Conrad's Book: "The Highway to a Commanding Place;" "The Radiant Athlete;" "Born to the Purple;" "The Brimming River of God's Love;" "Still God Said Positively 'No';" "When Religious Gesture is a Jest;" "Twenty Theses to which Evangelical Christianity is Committed." These titles whet one's appetite; one wants to see how the preacher develops them. What are those "Twenty Theses?" Well, the way to find that out is to get the book.

Prophecies of the End-Time. By Rev. Oswald J. Smith. The Christian Outlook Co., 15 Conrad Ave., Toronto, Canada. 25 cents.

Mr. Smith is the devoted and successful pastor of the Gospel Tabernacle in Toronto, and is a diligent student of the Bible. He takes the pre-millenarian view. He does not hold the historical interpretation of the book of Revelation, but the futurist view. His firm belief is that the End-Time is near at hand; that the second coming of Christ is imminent, though he sets no dates. We have never seen the program of the last times more clearly set forth. It is as follows: the Great Tribulation, the resurrection of the saints (the first resurrection), the Rapture, the Millennium (Christ's earthly reign for a thousand years), Satan let loose for a short time, the second resurrection, the final judgment. The imagery of Revelation is explained. It is an interesting book, whatever may be one's views on eschatology.

The Ceaseless Circle. By John Luke Gehman, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York, Chicago, London and Edinburgh. $1.50.

The author, who is a brilliant preacher of the west, has gotten hold of the idea of cycles. He speaks of "a certain cyclic tendency strikingly evident in the course of human events and throughout the universe in general." Whether the idea came to him originally from Oswald Spengler's book, *The Decline of the West* (for he mentions this work), we do not know. There does seem to be such a tendency in financial matters, for it seems that, every so often, we must have a panic in the economic world. But Dr. Gehman can also see good in this tendency of things to circle around back to the place from which they started. Selecting Solomon's saying, "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days," as a basis, he preaches a most helpful sermon on the reward of service. While the mighty Nile overflows, the farmer sows his seed on the still waters covering his land; then, before the waters recede, the sediment from it has dropped and covered the seed, which will in time bring forth its harvest. The author sees this ceaseless circle in history, in the larger life, in "the music of the spheres," in the universe, in God as the center, and "holy ground" as the circumference. There is nothing erratic about the author's book, but it is characterized by originality and uniqueness. In the suggestive sermon on "the music of the spheres," he says that religion is "man trying to find his place in the universal order." He quotes Millikan, the scientist, as saying that physics has "thrown the mechanistic view of the world root and branch out of its home." Even Charles Darwin once said: "As we consider the whole universe, the mind refuses to look at it as the outcome of chance."

Heaven or Hell—Which? A Study of the Life Hereafter. By Rev. R. C. Campbell. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York City. $1.50.

In these days of soft-pedaling on some of the doctrines of Holy Scripture, it is distinctly refreshing to read after an author

who has a firm and unflinching faith in the whole teaching of the Word of God. Mr. Campbell does not mince matters. He believes fully in the final and eternal salvation of believers and in the eternal doom of the impenitent and unbelieving. He feels in conscience bound to declare the whole counsel of God, and will not hold back any truth in unrighteousness. Any man who accepts and preaches such a rugged theology will displease the Modernists, but he will be a soul-winner; and that is what we understand Mr. Campbell to be. And soul-winning is the greatest occupation in the world. At times Mr. Campbell is quite piercing and epigrammatic. For example note this:

> You cannot follow the devil and go to heaven, for he is not traveling in that direction. The reverse of that is true; you cannot follow the Lord and go to hell. The Lord is traveling a different road and going in a different direction.

The Gospel According to Luke. By G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York; also Chicago, London and Edinburgh. $2.50.

To interpret and apply the teaching of the Bible is a fine art. In this book Dr. Morgan displays his well-known insight, incisiveness and originality in making the Bible a living and engaging book. No detail of any importance seems to escape him. Chapter by chapter, verse by verse, he analyzes and applies. There is very little exhortation, for the Word will accomplish its own purposes if it is properly set forth in connection with man's needs and aspirations. In his comments on Luke as God's instrument, Dr. Morgan gives his conception of the intimate relation of the divine and human elements in the production of the Bible. He puts it in this way:

> The men who wrote these books of the New Testament were not mere automata. God wrought through the personality selected by the Holy Spirit. I am prepared to go further. He always selected men who were by natural gifts, when controlled by divine guidance, fitted for their work.

For that reason Dr. Morgan believes that St. Luke was peculiarly adapted for the writing of the New Testament books attributed to him. On this point our author is worth quoting again:

> As far as I am concerned, I say without hesitation, Matthew could not have written from that standpoint, the standpoint of a Greek scholar; Mark certainly could not have done so, neither could John. They all had the same material and Person; but differing men, chosen of the Holy Spirit, saw different phases of truth.

So the cultured Greek scholar, St. Luke, when he apprehended Christ, set forth the ideal of absolute perfection in Him, because he found "in Christ that which fulfilled the highest in his thinking before he found Christ," and corrected and destroyed "everything that was false in that thinking." It is true, this book by Dr. Morgan is not a commentary in the ordinary sense of the term; it is a scholarly exposition and practical application. Wherever he finds something deeper or more suggestive in the Greek or Hebrew, he gives his readers the benefit of his findings. Many books have been written on the gospel according to Luke, but this one certainly has enough unique features to make it worth while.

The Bible and the Child. By G. Campbell Morgan, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., 158 Fifth Ave., New York. Paper covers, 35 cents.

In this booklet the psychology of the child is keenly analyzed, and an effort is made to fit Biblical instruction to every period of his development. For the primary, junior and intermediate grades suitable outlines of Bible courses are given. If these should be followed, the pupil would surely have a comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the Bible, and ought to be prepared for service in the church of Christ. We note that Dr. Morgan is ready to abandon the term "faculty" in psychology; yet he finds difficulty in avoiding the term. We think it a correct term to use, if it means, not a part of the mind, but a specific functioning power of the *whole* mind; the mind operating in a certain way that can be distinguished from its other ways of operating. For example, the mind functions in intellect, in emotion, in volition: sometimes we reflect, sometimes we reason, sometimes we feel, sometimes we will or choose.

Additional Literary Notes

The January-March number of the *Bible League Quarterly* (45 Doughty Street, Bedford Row, London, W.C.1, England) is such a valuable issue that we wish to make a few notes on parts of its contents. In the first place, an editorial points out some of the unsound teaching of Dr. S. D. Gordon's book, entitled *Quiet Talks*. Elsewhere we have referred to his acceptance of the perilous theory of deutero-Isaiah (see our "Comments on Topics of the Times.")

In Gordon's *Quiet Talks about Jesus*, p. 118, he says, "There is no cross in God's Plan of atonement." This certainly is a departure from plain Biblical teaching. Jesus said, "And I, If I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." Then the evangelist adds, "This He said, signifying what death He should die." In the light of all that followed, it is obvious that Christ referred to his death on the cross as the means of drawing men unto Himself.

In Matthew 20:19 Jesus foretold the manner of His death: "And they (the chief priest and scribes) shall deliver Him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify." Paul's testimony is clear (Phil.2: 8): "And being found in fashion as a man, He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Read this also (Gal.3: 13): "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, because it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree;" which can refer only to our Lord's substitutional death on the cross.

In the same book Dr. Gordon says: "It clears the ground not to have any theory about Jesus' death." Of course, the statement is true, but the implication is all wrong. Certainly we do not want a *theory* of the meaning of our Lord's death, but we do want the true Biblical doctrine; and that is not a theory; it is a fact. What kind of a nebulous theology is that which has no conception of the purpose of the incarnate Son's sacrifice on the cross? If we are clear in our conceptions anywhere, we ought to be clear regarding the meaning and purpose of Christ's atoning sacrifice. "He who knew no sin became sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God through Him" (2 Cor. 5:21).

A valuable article in the above-named magazine bears the title, "New Testament Quotations from the Old Testament." It is written by Algernon J. Pollock, who is evidently a competent critical scholar. In reply to a modernistic writer who makes a serious attack on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, on the ground that the New Testament writers did not always quote verbatim from either the Hebrew Bible or the Septuagint, Mr. Pollock maintains, with real critical ability and spiritual insight, that the Holy Spirit has a right to quote from Himself by giving the true sense in every case in the light of the fulfillment and the further revelation of the New Testament dispensation. The modernist to whom Mr. Pollock refers is Dr. E. Griffith-Jones, who is also an advocate of evolution, having written the book entitled, *The Ascent of Man*, meaning that man ascended from the anthropoid ape instead of having been created directly in the divine image. Anent the subject in hand, Mr. Pollock says:

> The answer to the foolish charge of Principal Griffith-Jones is, that the inspired writers in the New Testament quoted just as much from the Old Testament as suited the purpose of the divine Mind, and altered or amplified it, when necessary, in order to convey, not merely the meaning of the Old Testament passage, but the exact meaning intended to be conveyed by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament. . . . In short, a quotation from the Old Testament, altered to suit the mind of the Holy Spirit, is as much inspired as the original words; and the New Testament rendering is as much Scripture as the passage quoted, and has equal authority.

Then Mr. Pollock cites a number of instances in which the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament gives the fuller and deeper meaning of the latter in the clear light of the former. Thus the fuller New Testament revelation illumines the more partial revelations previously given.

No doubt some of our readers are aware of the publication in England of a translation of Robert Eisler's book, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*. In the said number of the *Bible League Quarterly* a well-reasoned article shows that Eisler's subjectivism has greatly colored his historical analyses. Instead of accepting what the New Testament plainly says, he either rejects what does not agree with his pre-conceived notions, or tries to "interpret" them (rather *twist* them) to suit his purposes. Think of a person, for example, reading something like this into the gospel narratives, namely, that Christ's "ascendancy over His followers was attributed to the performing of sham miracles by magical arts, as well as to a demagogical power of oratory." By whom was it so attributed? By the Scribes and Pharisees, our Lord's bitterest enemies. So Eisler sides in with the quibbling Scribes and Pharisees of Christ's day. The critic says of Eisler's handling of Josephus that the so-called "falsifications" of the text by Christian writers "are pure inventions of the writer, as not one definite proof of interpolation by them has been produced."

Another book that is more worthy of notice is Professor W. Schmidt's *The Origin and Growth of Religion,* which has been translated from the German into the English. The learned author is a professor in the University of Vienna. The original and striking views of Professor Schmidt are well known among anthropologists and students of comparative religion, and are now made available to English and American readers by this translation, which has been made by Professor H. J. Rose, of the University of St. Andrew's, Scotland. A somewhat lengthy review by Professor Macmurray is reprinted in the *Bible League Quarterly.* In view of Dr. Schmidt's criticisms of evolution, based on vast knowledge of nature and history, Dr. Macmurray has this to say:

> Evolution as a philosophy is evidently on the wane. Even in biology the scientists are more than a little dubious about its usefulness as an hypothesis in the laboratory. . . . We are coming back to a shamefaced sanity again; and if it is an unpleasant experience, it is undoubtedly profitable.

In the department of sociology known as the history of religion, Professor Macmurray says:

> Professor Schmidt is admittedly one of the highest authorities. Even if one disagrees with his conclusions, it is impossible to dismiss them with a wave of the hand as the theories of a crank. His range of accurate knowledge of the facts of primitive life is too wide. His analysis of the facts is too careful. His criticism of rival theories is too thorough. His method of dealing with the subject is too cautiously scientific.

Note this statement, which agrees with what has often been said in this magazine and which agrees with the conclusions of Dr. M. J. Stolee, whose book, *The Origin of Religion,* has been given favorable notice a number of times in this journal:

> Yet Professor Schmidt holds that the most primitive form of religion which scientific investigation has enabled us to discover in all quarters of the globe, proves to be just such a pure ethical monotheism, and that the problem to be solved is the degradation of this primitive religion in the course of human history.

This speaks volumes. Here is Dr. Macmurray's conclusion:

> If Professor Schmidt is even half right, then it look as though the great struggle between religion and science were going to end, after all, in the triumph of religion. For religion is the most distinctively humane of all our activities; and if *that* escapes from the law of evolutionary development, it is probable that evolution is inapplicable to the field of human history altogether.

Another article in the said *Quarterly* gives some timely warning against Turton's *The Truth of Christianity,* which has had a considerable vogue here in America. Running through the whole book is the theory of evolution. God is called "the Author of evolution." He says, "Man is the highest being that has even been evolved." In the index are these two references: "Mistakes of the Old Testament;" "Mistakes of the New Testament." He declares that "some Bible difficulties, as they are called, are fatal to the theory of verbal inspiration," etc. He is so obsessed with evolution that he connects it with the incarnation of the Son of God:

> When we consider that God the Son as the Divine Person by whom the world was made and who has been evolving it through countless ages from its original matter into higher and higher forms of life, there seems a special fitness in its leading up to such a climax as the Incarnation. (p.228).

All one needs to do is to think of the selfish struggle for existence among animals and savage men as the means employed to produce progress up to man and the incarnation, to see and feel how repulsive such a doctrine is. On the atonement Mr. Turton is not evangelical, for he says: "Christ did not suffer in our stead; Christ did not bear man's punishment" (p.294). The critic tells us that Turton's book contains not a single intimation of the following basic truths of Christianity: ruin by the fall; redemption by substitution; regeneration by the Holy Spirit; salvation by grace; justification by faith. We are sorry to be compelled to make these strictures, but we fear that the so-called "Christianity" upheld in this book is not the pure Christianity of Christ and the Bible.

Dr. Bird S. Coler, Commissioner of Public Welfare in New York City, has come out in defense of Christian marriage and the Christian home in a book entitled, *He Made Them Twain.* He justly rebukes those who advocate lax ideas of sex relations. In stating his aim in the book, he says:

> I hope to show that the thing that Mr. Russell and his group are advocating would destroy the very foundations of our civilization; that, whether we view "companionism" from the standpoint of biology, of history, of social science, of religion, or of present-day experience, its inevitable results are unhappiness for the individual and death for the nation that adopts it.

A competent reviewer says that Dr. Coler sustains his claim. and he gives the book a strong commendation.

On account of having inadvertently failed to renew our subscription, *The Evangelical Quarterly* has not received any notice in our columns for some months. But now the subscription has been renewed, and along comes the January number, solid in every way. What a menu of good things it spreads before the reader who is interested in religion, theology and science. Every article is written by a specialist in his line. Every person who desires information and stimulus would surely want to read articles on the following subjects: "Determinism and Responsibility;" "The Bible in the Light of the Latest Science;" "The Canon of the Old Testament;" "Revelation and Pedagogics;" "The Higher Criticism," etc. The book reviews are real reviews, not wooden, noncommittal ones. The editors are kind enough to give a list of articles that appeared in CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE for December last. Drs. John R. Mackay and Donald Maclean, of Edinburgh, are the editors, and James Clarke and Company, 9 Essex Street, London, W.C.2, are the publishers. Price 10s. 6d.; about $1.75 in American money.

Two beautiful books from Harper & Brothers, 49 East 33rd Street, New York, have come too late for review in this number. They are noticed here so that readers will not need to wait another month to know about them. The first is, *The Pilgrim's Progress: John Bunyan's Story Re-written for Young People,* by Wade C. Smith. It is strikingly illustrated by "the Little Jetts." Price, $1.50. The second is, *The Acts of the Apostles,* by Dr. W. Graham Scroggie, which is truly described as "a golden treasury of fact and comment on the great missionary book of the Bible." Price, $1.25.

Editor's Mail

Another Student in Trouble

DEAR DR. SLOAN:

I am still rejoicing in the thoughts which you produced on my mind last Wednesday in the church at Somerville, Massachusetts. I wish I had heard those words a few weeks before. It would have helped me to answer Prof. ——— of the Institute under whom I studied "The Bible as Literature," a short course given as a general study at the school.

During my three years at the Institute I have come up against considerable opposition to the body of Christian truths which I had held for many years. I had been converted at fourteen years of age . . . when I came to the school about three years ago I was confronted with an opposition which was totally different from anything I had faced from the ordinary public. I continued to defend my faith against everything, but I confess that often I was in doubt as to whether I was doing it in defense of a truth or only in defense of an highly developed superstition. Often I could see through the farce and high-toned bluff which some of our instructors in English and History offered, and I rejoiced to see them back down when I "called" their bluff. But often an offensive was given which was clothed in all that would appeal to a young mind as being scientific and logical.

I was not prepared to resist effectively in such cases. I was taught the development of modern man as a result of the natural causes of nature. I came in contact with varied philosophies. My precious beliefs were placed on the same level with all the superstitious beliefs which ever had engaged the mind of man. I was taught how the man of the past could evolve superstition into a respectable-appearing religious belief, and my faith was made to appear of the same origin. I was taught all these and more. You can see how these could effect any young mind which was just emerging out of a supposed mediocrity into a new life of intellectual developments. I was truly affected.

I thank God that at no time did I fully stop or turn around. When I was in doubt, still the impetus given by my past Christian experience was enough to tide me over till a new light appeared. I have often tried to analyze my past to see if, somehow, I could

not have been prepared against these difficulties. I have a class of boys in the Sunday school and am the associate superintendent of the school. I thought of them. I wondered if somehow I could not prepare them so that if they should come up against the same things they would not fall. I have seen so many who were not as strong in Christian experience as I had been, and they could not stand up under it. I want to help prepare my class and our Sunday school entire if possible!

It is concerning these matters that I am writing to you for advice, for I am persuaded that you can fully appreciate the things I am writing you. I am persuaded that the preparation I had could have been much better. I am made to believe the mode of teaching in the Sunday schools I have visited to be entirely antiquated and insufficient for modern needs. Therefore I believe unless something is done, the evangelical churches will have to rejoice only in the most mediocre of minds, for it seems that only such minds hang on from the Sunday school to the church. The most worthwhile students are caught away with the sudden change which comes upon entering college. I believe I could have been taught more of life and its problems as it actually exists in the intellectual world. I could have been made acquainted with the theories and facts which have to do with mankind. Then when I entered college my eyes would not have been suddenly opened up to totally new ideas. I might be ready to choose from the many new thoughts, if only I had a passing knowledge of things beforehand.

In proposing changes I have won over our superintendent, but there is some opposition from other members of the church. In my teaching I have tried to acquaint the boys with the various theories and ideas which are prevalent among magazines and books. Thus when we spoke of liberty and individual freedom I tried to give them also some ideas about the gradual development of political freedom, about the theories of Rousseau, J. S. Mills, modern writers, and others. I try also to give a fair representation of the factors influencing the conduct of man, as hereditary, and environmental effects, and the operation of the will which can be touched by the divine and made to be the most prominent factor upon choice of the individual.

In short, I am trying to give them what I wish I had had. I try to revive a spirit of active discussion, debate, and questioning, within limits. The class, ranging in age from fourteen to seventeen years, seems to enjoy it and shows active interest. The method seems to work very well in maintaining good behavior among some who had even been considered impossible. I expect also to take them to some lectures on biology and physics at the school to acquaint them with some phases there.

Now, Dr. Sloan, I wish to ask some advice. I have written this very lengthy letter to acquaint you with the actual facts, if possible. As I said before, there is some opposition to my ideas. Some have expressed to me the idea that only the Scriptures should be expounded to the pupils with no regard to the outside requirements. It seems to me, however, that only an experience in Christ which is founded on more than ignorance of everything else can survive when tested. My own experience has very powerfully effected my ideas. Some have said that their children would never go to a college. This spirit practically infers that a requirement for good Christianity is plain ignorance. I detest this spirit.

But I would like very much to be advised by you. Do you think that I have allowed my own experiences to influence my ideas of the function of the church and Sunday school to become one-sided? If you should approve the ideas I have expressed would you advise me to work for their acceptance among other classes against the opposition that may have to be met?

I feel guilty for requiring so much of your time but this has been on my mind too long already, and I believe you can help me. I have prayed earnestly for guidance, and what you say shall be part of my answered prayers. I feel an ever-growing urge to work which will mean the salvation of men. I have long felt a preparation for some peculiar position when I am ready before the Lord. As I told you, I am now studying physics. I hope to be able to approach the modern public with a little better contact than most young preachers seem to make. God willing I hope to be on the field in a very few years. This seems to be the plan of God in my life as I see it now. Any advice which you see fit to give on any phase of these statements shall be received with thanks.—*B.*